

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FRIDAY, MAY 29, 1936

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Open our eyes, O Lord, that we may see wondrous things out of Thy law. Give us not the spirit of fearfulness, but of power and love and discipline. Look upon us in our limitations and transgressions with divine compassion and mercy. We rejoice that there is a God who has adapted Himself to the wants of men; that there is a ruling spirit in the center of power and wisdom that knows how to love the unlovable and will endure more and more gloriously through the ages of time. Almighty God, as sin is a rebuke to any people, we beseech Thee to shed abroad Thy peace in all this troubled world and make it radiant with righteousness, truth, and wisdom. Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Horne, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 12120. An act to provide for the further development of vocational education in the several States and Territories.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 4549. An act authorizing the State Highway Board of the State of Georgia to replace, reconstruct, or repair the free highway bridge across the Savannah River at or near the city of Augusta, Ga.; and

S. 4618. An act granting the consent of Congress to the Louisiana Highway Commission to construct, maintain, and operate a free or toll highway bridge, or a railway bridge in combination with a free or toll highway bridge, and approaches thereto across the Mississippi River at or near Baton Rouge, La.

ORDER OF BUSINESS

The SPEAKER. There are two special orders this morning. With the indulgence of the gentlemen who are to be recognized under those special orders, the Chair will recognize Members to prefer unanimous-consent requests which will not involve any time.

GOOD HOUSEKEEPING URGES THE WOMEN OF AMERICA TO SUPPORT THE PEACE AMENDMENT

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a magazine article which deals with a bill I have introduced.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, is the article very long?

Mr. LUDLOW. It is not. My remarks and the article will probably not consume more than a page and a half of the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, with the whole world in a state of seething restlessness; with greed and hatred fanning the flames of strife in many lands; with dictators thrumming the strings of war; with the tramp, tramp, tramp of marching feet echoing and reechoing throughout Europe, Africa, and the Orient; with portentous and unmistakable signs indicating the imminence of a conflict that may almost, if not quite, destroy civilization; are we going to sit idly by and permit this Seventy-fourth Congress to adjourn sine die without doing something of an effective nature to save our precious

boys from being dragged into the slaughter pens of foreign wars?

I once knew a great man who, in spite of his patrician birth and ancestry, and his high position of wealth and distinction in society, always took compassionate interest in the problems of the poor, and the most stirring eulogy in a deluge of laudatory comment on his life and works after he had passed to the Great Beyond was a simple sentence expressed by a member of the bar of my home city:

He had a conscience that never slept.

Realizing the frightful possibilities of the world situation I cannot refrain from expressing the fervent wish that the consciences of Members of Congress would never sleep until we enact legislation at this very session of Congress to protect America from involvement in the terrible tragedies that lurk just beyond our visible horizon. If we think hard and prayerfully we will have to admit that we have done nothing worth while at this session to keep our country out of war.

The neutrality law we have enacted is so weak a four-horse team could be driven through it. It is no protection. Our well-meant McSwain bill to take the profit out of war by statute has struck the reefs and floundered in the Senate. We are driving rapidly toward the close of the Congress, leaving America pathetically exposed to war.

It is not, even now, too late to do something if we will take up and pass House Joint Resolution No. 167, the war-referendum and anti-war-profits resolution I have introduced. It provides for an amendment to the Constitution: (a) To permit the people of America to vote on a declaration of war except in the case of attack or invasion and; (b) to take the profit out of war.

Take the profit out of war and there will be few wars. The referendum part of my proposed amendment is based on the philosophy that those who have to suffer and, if need be, to die and to bear the crushing burdens and sorrows of war, shall have something to say as to whether war shall be declared.

Not through pride of authorship but from a firm conviction I am certain that this is the best proposal so far advanced to keep our country out of foreign wars. I believe that if it is adopted America will never enter another war except righteous wars of self-defense.

The magazine, Good Housekeeping, which numbers its readers by the millions, has placed its powerful influence back of my proposed peace amendment, and it has entered upon a patriotic campaign to introduce my resolution to the women of America as a measure that will serve effectively to keep America out of war. Who has a better right to vote on a declaration of war than the wives, mothers, sisters, and sweethearts of the men whose lives will be thrown into the holocaust if there is another war? Women go down into the valley of the shadow of death to bring our boys into the world. Why should they not have something to say as to whether their flesh and blood shall be hurled into the hell of foreign conflicts?

Mr. William F. Bigelow, the distinguished and wise editor of Good Housekeeping, has undertaken to point out to the women of America how very important it is that my resolution shall pass as a protection to the homes and firesides and the lives of our fine young Americans.

He is urging women all over this country to request their Members of Congress to sign discharge petition no. 28 which I have filed at the Speaker's desk as the only means available under parliamentary procedure to bring my proposed peace amendment out of committee and before the House for action at this session. The discharge petition will not become effective unless, or until, 218 Members of the House sign it.

Under the caption "Good Housekeeping Advocates a Peace Amendment" the following appears in the June issue of that magazine:

On the 14th of February 1935, Mr. LOUIS LUDLOW, Representative from Indiana, introduced the following joint resolution in Congress:

"SECTION 1. Except in the event of an invasion of the United States or its territorial possessions and attack upon its citizens residing therein, the authority of Congress to declare war shall not become effective until confirmed by a majority of all votes cast thereon in a Nation-wide referendum. Congress may by law provide for the enforcement of this section.

"SEC. 2. Whenever war is declared, the President shall immediately conscript and take over for use by the Government all the public and private war properties, yards, factories, and supplies, fixing the compensation for private properties temporarily employed for the war period at a rate not in excess of 4 per centum, based on tax values assessed in the year preceding the war."

The resolution was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary. A hearing on the bill was held June 19, 1935. Mr. LUDLOW has made several attempts to have the bill reported out so that it can be debated on the floor of the House, but the bill was still in committee on May 1st. A letter to your Congressman urging him, or her, to sign discharge petition no. 28 at the Speaker's desk may force the reporting of the bill. As this is the second session of the Seventy-fourth Congress, no bills will hold over; the peace amendment bill will die with all the others bottled up in committees. It will therefore be necessary for a new bill to be introduced when the Seventy-fifth Congress convenes in January 1937.

Such a bill will be introduced; we can promise our readers that. It may, probably will, be worded differently, but its chief purpose will be the same: so to amend the Constitution as to give to the people the right to pass judgment on any proposal to go to a war outside our own borders. Note that no attempt is made to curtail the authority of Congress "in the event of an invasion." No sensible person would want to delay action by our armed forces in such an emergency. We should at all times be prepared to strike, and strike hard, if we are attacked.

Now a peace amendment is not going to be passed by Congress unless voters demand that it be passed. It means giving up power that Congress has always held unrestrictedly. Many Congressmen think that that power should be given up, that no small group should hold in its hands the destiny of a people—possibly the death sentences of millions of our youth. So here is something for women to do—mothers of sons, wives, sisters, sweethearts. Men who will vote for a peace amendment—the beginning of the end of war for this country—can be elected in November—if the women say they must be.

Mr. Eby (Kerr Eby) replied as follows when we told him about the peace amendment:

"By the Lord Harry, I believe you may have nailed something! Not because such an amendment seems right and proper to me, but because it would drag the question right out into the open to be fought for and against. It is a concrete issue. Something to get hold of. It has the beauty of being truly democratic American in that it uses our own institutions in our own way. * * * Your idea is grandly democratic to me. Those who are about to die can vote on it.

"At the risk of being officious, I'd suggest that the idea of the President and Congress being wholly at liberty in defense should be heavily stressed, and (this I most sincerely believe) neither our Army nor Navy should be weakened in the least—until the time all nations acquire some sense. I'm just nut enough to believe that time will come. The world is literally dying for peace."

In its May issue Good Housekeeping published the following powerful appeal which I wish every woman in America—especially every mother—might read and ponder over:

A PEACE AMENDMENT

We are suggesting a big thing for Mothers' Day—for the Mothers' Days of all the years to come. Flowers our mothers have had in profusion, and flowers they will have as long as flowers are given as tokens of love. Another significance is becoming attached to the day: A solicitude for all mothers, that they may have the care that belongs to every woman who brings a child into the world. And now we are ready to consider the next big forward step: To say to mothers that, without the consent of the majority of the voters in a referendum, their sons and daughters may not be drafted for war purposes, unless the country is attacked or invaded. This assurance should come, can only come, through an amendment to the Constitution. Let us call it the peace amendment.

The power to declare war is, in the Constitution, given unrestrictedly to Congress. In the beginning there was nothing else to do; the people were so widely scattered, the means of communication so slow and unreliable, that it was impossible to discuss with the Nation the things that might seem to be driving it to war, and ask for a referendum vote. Now all that is changed. By means of the radio every voter may sit at the President's desk and listen to his reasons for asking a declaration of war. It is no longer necessary for a small group of men and women—531 at present—to have the power to make the decision that may mean to millions of young men that they are to be offered as bloody or gassed sacrifices to the god of war, that their bodies may be left, as useless to the world as to themselves, on foreign battlefields. They who will have to do the fighting will know, as well as do the Members of Congress, the reasons why the fighting should be done. And their lives should not be pawned without their consent.

The question as to whether Congress has ever abused its power need not enter here. It is the question of a larger right that we are discussing. There is so much evidence that all wars are useless and that they not only waste lives and livelihoods but fail to settle disputes between nations, that there is abundant reason for declaring that the people themselves should decide whether they want the Nation to go to war. That does not touch the matter of defense in case of attack. As commander in chief of the Army and Navy, the President can use these forces at any time. And in the world as it is now and seems likely to be for a long time to come, those forces should be sufficient to meet any emergency, any possible combination of nations against our own.

There is now pending before the House of Representatives a bill proposing a peace amendment. At a hearing on the bill its author, Hon. Louis LUDLOW, of Indiana, said: "The decision as to whether there shall be war or peace should be made * * * by the 125,000,000 people who comprise the American Nation * * *. This proposal reaches to the very fundamentals of equality as defined in the Declaration of Independence. It makes me indignant to think that a man, just because he happens to hold an official station, may order me out to be shot and killed without consulting me; and in the interest of justice, in the interest of perpetuating the principles of equality on which this Nation arose in majesty out of the oppressions of the past, it is time to revise the fundamental law of the land so that every citizen of the Republic, however poor and humble, shall have an equal right with every other citizen to decide whether or not this Nation shall go to war."

Yes, there are arguments against a peace amendment, and lots of them—perhaps as many as were raised against any amendment ever proposed or ratified. One of them is that a referendum would cause delay. Gen. Smedley D. Butler—you will remember that he was with the marines at Chateau Thierry and Belleau Wood—is for it just for that reason. "I believe it will delay action", he said, "and that therefore all these adjustments can be made. There is no necessity for fighting except in cases of invasion." And there are many more objections. But we are not so much concerned with the negatives based on the difficulty of going to war that this amendment would impose—for we think they are largely mechanical and could be solved—as we are with the fact that killing men to settle disputes is a senseless pastime, as outmoded as it is costly. This whole thing is not a question of whether power should be taken from Congress, but whether there should not be given back to the people the right to decide whether or not they are willing to have their sons killed in battle or die of wounds or disease or spend a lifetime in pain.

Women have asked Good Housekeeping what they can do to end war. We believe that work for a peace amendment promises better results than anything else they can do, for with such an amendment war, so far as this country is concerned, will be a thing of the past. The people will not vote for the United States to take war to another nation. And if we give no cause for war—and keep our powder dry—we will not be attacked.

Now, you mothers * * *

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that immediately after the address of the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CARPENTER], I may address the House for 3 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that immediately following the remarks of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. YOUNG], I may address the House for 3 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

DON'T LET THEM FOOL YOU, MR. FARMER! HERE ARE THE FACTS

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for one-half minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. Speaker, for months now we have been hearing from certain newspapers and certain politicians that as a result of the policies of this administration the plight of the American farmer has become more and more unbearable.

We are told that he has not really made any progress in the last 3½ years, and that, on the contrary, the American farmers' precious home market is being taken away from them by tariff negotiation which let in a flood of competitive farm imports.

We are subjected to sensational stories of how Chinese coolies and South American peons are unfairly competing with the American farmer in his own front yard.

LET US LOOK AT THE RECORD

Mr. Speaker, I would not for a moment deny to these sensationalists the right to make all the ridiculous statements they wish to about the policies and accomplishments of this administration, but I would humbly suggest that every once in a while in a political campaign there ought to be a breathing spell during which a few indisputable, unassailable facts could be introduced and examined by the electorate.

I believe that the people of my district wish more than anything else to know the facts on these controversial issues, and I consider it both a duty and a privilege to present these facts.

WHAT TABLE NO. 1 REVEALS

The figures I use are the official statistics made public by the Department of Commerce and analyzed by the Bureau of Agricultural Economics of the Department of Agriculture.

Table 1 shows agricultural imports classified between non-competitive and competitive products.

Referring to the last column of competitive imports minus sugar, it will be noted that, while these imports were considerably larger in 1935 than in immediately preceding years, they were substantially smaller than in the years prior to 1931.

TABLE 1.—Value of United States agricultural imports, 1921–35

Calendar year	Agricultural imports				
	Total	Noncompetitive	Competitive ¹	Sugar	Competitive minus sugar
	Million dollars	Million dollars	Million dollars	Million dollars	Million dollars
1921.....	1,323	584	739	235	504
1922.....	1,638	773	865	252	613
1923.....	2,038	933	1,105	380	725
1924.....	1,918	927	991	364	627
1925.....	2,355	1,339	1,016	246	770
1926.....	2,415	1,444	971	232	739
1927.....	2,219	1,225	994	258	736
1928.....	2,106	1,145	961	207	754
1929.....	2,218	1,201	1,017	209	808
1930.....	1,468	799	669	130	539
1931.....	1,007	561	446	113	333
1932.....	608	372	296	97	199
1933.....	743	396	377	108	269
1934 ²	858	408	450	118	332
1935 ²	1,106	483	623	134	489

¹ Competitive agricultural imports include imports similar to agricultural products commercially produced in the United States or directly substituted to a significant extent for domestic agricultural products.

² Imports for consumption.

Foreign Agricultural Service Division. Compiled from Foreign Commerce and Navigation of the United States and official records of the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce.

The United States has for many years imported regularly and in large volume a number of competitive agricultural products, such as wool, sugar, and flaxseed. But it is not these "regularly imported" products which have aroused general interest in recent months. Most of the recent discussion in regard to agricultural imports has been concerned with such products as grain and feed, meats, dairy products, and eggs.

IMPORTS DECREASE

When the monthly statistics of imports of these latter products are examined for the period January 1934 to date, it will be found that these imports started to increase in the middle or latter part of 1934. They reached their peak, taking the groups as a whole, during the middle of 1935 and have since shown a marked recession. Generally speaking, the imports of grain, which started in 1934, declined abruptly or ceased as soon as the crops of 1935 became available. The imports of livestock products have held up longer simply because it takes more time to restore livestock numbers than to increase the production of annual crops.

WHEAT, CORN, OATS, BARLEY, RYE

TABLE 2.—United States: Import quantity, 1922–33 and January 1934 to March 1936¹

SPECIFIED GRAINS

Year (ended Dec. 31) and month	Wheat, grain ²	Corn, grain	Oats, grain	Barley, malt ²	Rye, grain ²
	<i>Bushels</i>	<i>Bushels</i>	<i>Bushels</i>	<i>Pounds</i>	<i>Bushels</i>
1922.....	10,560,000	113,000	1,299,000	60,000	126,000
1923.....	8,930,000	203,000	317,000	397,000	1,000
1924.....	6,895,000	4,107,000	6,964,000	765,000	1,000
1925.....	1,308,000	1,086,000	178,000	836,000	1,000
1926.....	451,000	1,055,000	157,000	1,028,000	(9)
1927.....	21,000	5,458,000	85,000	810,000	(9)
1928.....	224,000	565,000	489,000	865,000	2,000
1929.....	36,000	407,000	112,000	1,025,000	(9)
1930.....	317,000	1,556,000	183,000	4,309,000	7,000
1931.....	54,000	618,000	576,000	39,875,000	82,000
1932.....	3,000	344,000	59,000	52,533,000	(9)
1933.....	31,000	160,000	132,000	109,183,000	8,006,000
1934:					
January.....	9,000	18,000	6,000	11,520,000	0
February.....	37,000	15,000	2,000	9,788,000	276,000
March.....	24,000	17,000	(9)	14,724,000	173,000
April.....	51,000	11,000	4,000	17,943,000	869,000
May.....	1,000	14,000	1,000	18,265,000	572,000
June.....	1,000	77,000	7,000	22,490,000	2,054,000
July.....	2,000	24,000	152,000	25,407,000	1,021,000
August.....	432,000	195,000	27,000	20,056,000	241,000
September.....	2,779,000	445,000	210,000	14,283,000	521,000
October.....	1,087,000	501,000	1,087,000	11,441,000	455,000
November.....	1,407,000	470,000	1,672,000	12,876,000	1,307,000
December.....	1,907,000	1,172,000	2,412,000	14,926,000	133,000
Total.....	7,737,000	2,959,000	5,580,000	193,728,000	7,622,000
1935:					
January.....	843,000	1,887,000	1,644,000	17,449,000	1,009,000
February.....	1,055,000	1,826,000	2,118,000	15,459,000	1,177,000
March.....	1,458,000	3,304,000	2,596,000	27,197,000	1,613,000
April.....	1,611,000	1,445,000	2,167,000	30,701,000	670,000
May.....	847,000	3,036,000	1,124,000	37,794,000	2,283,000
June.....	625,000	6,122,000	406,000	43,728,000	799,000
July.....	793,000	5,649,000	29,000	42,041,000	357,000
August.....	2,570,000	8,554,000	1,000	27,136,000	1,464,000
September.....	3,644,000	2,988,000	7,000	27,566,000	65,000
October.....	5,324,000	4,690,000	5,000	16,933,000	204,000
November.....	4,348,000	1,651,000	2,000	18,916,000	1,000
December.....	4,321,000	2,062,000	8,000	15,703,000	1,000
Total.....	27,439,000	43,242,000	10,107,000	320,623,000	9,643,000
1936:					
January.....	2,231,000	1,869,000	0	15,190,000	0
February.....	2,398,000	583,000	6,000	15,554,000	20,000
March.....	2,673,000	1,186,000	5,000	18,153,000	0

¹ General imports prior to 1934; beginning Jan. 1, 1934, imports for consumption.

² Imports for consumption.

³ For domestic consumption includes only wheat full duty paid and 10 percent ad valorem.

⁴ Less than 500.

NO IMPORTS IN JANUARY

Table 2 shows the imports of certain selected products, by months, since January 1934.

It will be noted that the imports of oats began in small volume in July 1934 and reached a peak of 2,600,000 bushels in March 1935.

Imports of oats have been insignificant since July 1935, there being no imports whatever in January and only 6,000 bushels in February 1936.

A similar situation is shown in the imports of rye, which have been negligible since August 1935.

CORN IMPORTS EXPLAINED

The imports of corn continued longer than those of oats as the 1935 corn crop did not become available until November of that year.

Not only was the 1935 corn crop about 350,000,000 bushels below normal but the quality in many of the Corn Belt States was exceedingly poor, thus making a large part of it unfit for shipment.

The reduction below normal in last year's crop occurred largely in certain Corn Belt States which normally ship out considerable quantities.

Even with the reduced numbers of livestock in the United States the 1935 corn crop was inadequate, because existing stocks had to be replenished, feed requirements per animal unit were larger as a result of the severe winter, and, in addition, industrial utilization of corn increased.

FARMERS MAKE MONEY ON CORN

As a result of the above factors, domestic corn prices continued at a level sufficiently high to permit the importation of corn from Argentina, where prices were very low as a result of a record crop last year.

These imports were confined largely to the coastal regions.

Nevertheless, imports of corn have been running substantially smaller during the current marketing season than in 1934-35, and the imports in March 1936, the latest month for which figures are available, were about 65 percent less than in March 1935.

The imports of barley malt, which started to assume significant proportions in 1934 after the repeal of prohibition, showed a considerable increase in 1935.

These imports reached a peak of almost 44,000,000 pounds in June 1935, but have since fallen off, amounting to 18,153,000 pounds in March 1936.

VERY LITTLE WHEAT IMPORTED

Imports of wheat continue at a higher level than in the 1934-35 season.

This is due to the fact that our spring wheat crop in 1935 was much below domestic requirements for this type of wheat and was also of unusually poor quality because of serious rust damage.

Nevertheless, imports of wheat from the 1st of July 1935 through March 1936 totaled only 28,000,000 bushels, or a little more than 4.5 percent of our total wheat production in 1935.

Imports through March were still below the estimated deficit in our spring wheat supplies this year.

ANIMALS AND ANIMAL PRODUCTS

Turning to animal and animal products, it will be observed in the following table that imports of cattle started to increase in February 1935 and continued throughout 1935 considerably above the corresponding months of 1934.

The total imports in 1935, however, of 378,000 head were substantially less than the imports in the years 1927 to 1929.

Imports of canned beef, most of which came from Argentina and Uruguay, have for many years been substantial.

Imports in 1935, however, were larger than in any year since 1929, and imports during the first 3 months of 1936 were somewhat larger than those of a year earlier.

CATTLE AND ANIMAL PRODUCTS

Year (ended Dec. 31) and month	Cattle, live	Beef, canned ¹	Butter	Tallow ¹	Egg products ²
	Head	Pounds	Pounds	Pounds	Pounds
1922.....	238,000	894,000	6,957,000	1,831,000	12,768,000
1923.....	140,000	4,495,000	23,741,000	10,823,000	12,565,000
1924.....	145,000	7,028,000	19,405,000	2,440,000	19,723,000
1925.....	175,000	7,909,000	7,212,000	1,828,000	33,987,000
1926.....	221,000	21,045,000	8,029,000	13,647,000	25,737,000
1927.....	445,000	35,959,000	8,460,000	12,908,000	15,341,000
1928.....	563,000	52,748,000	4,659,000	14,239,000	23,474,000
1929.....	605,000	79,899,000	2,773,000	16,803,000	26,030,000
1930.....	234,000	56,105,000	2,472,000	591,000	16,156,000
1931.....	95,000	19,586,000	1,882,000	1,365,000	7,661,000
1932.....	106,000	24,639,000	1,014,000	502,000	3,085,000
1933.....	82,000	41,344,000	1,022,000	239,000	3,664,000
1934:					
January.....	8,000	1,568,000	58,000	-----	255,000
February.....	7,000	1,344,000	59,000	-----	223,000
March.....	9,000	2,995,000	45,000	-----	221,000
April.....	16,000	3,782,000	55,000	-----	151,000
May.....	6,000	3,470,000	69,000	-----	216,000
June.....	5,000	2,519,000	74,000	-----	239,000
July.....	4,000	4,279,000	74,000	0	297,000
August.....	1,000	6,195,000	95,000	0	342,000
September.....	3,000	4,227,000	114,000	5,747,000	286,000
October.....	1,000	4,586,000	172,000	8,515,000	304,000
November.....	2,000	4,440,000	189,000	16,661,000	356,000
December.....	4,000	7,269,000	249,000	11,890,000	288,000
Total.....	66,000	46,674,000	1,253,000	42,813,000	3,178,000
1935:					
January.....	6,000	4,142,000	539,000	14,687,000	363,000
February.....	38,000	4,225,000	3,071,000	16,929,000	398,000
March.....	53,000	7,690,000	4,929,000	28,769,000	420,000
April.....	51,000	9,496,000	8,860,000	28,060,000	370,000
May.....	49,000	7,076,000	2,665,000	33,206,000	1,022,000
June.....	34,000	5,911,000	1,437,000	25,635,000	1,199,000
July.....	18,000	5,220,000	177,000	29,290,000	790,000
August.....	16,000	5,740,000	149,000	16,126,000	646,000
September.....	14,000	7,752,000	122,000	14,236,000	602,000
October.....	32,000	5,379,000	108,000	16,074,000	668,000

¹ Imports for consumption.

² Includes corned beef.

³ Excludes eggs in the shell.

LXXX—526

CATTLE AND ANIMAL PRODUCTS—continued

Year (ended Dec. 31) and month	Cattle, live	Beef, canned	Butter	Tallow	Egg products
	Head	Pounds	Pounds	Pounds	Pounds
1935—Continued.					
November.....	40,000	6,811,000	277,000	13,475,000	613,000
December.....	27,000	6,867,000	341,000	9,325,000	540,000
Total.....	378,000	76,309,000	22,675,000	245,851,000	7,631,000
1936:					
January.....	22,000	7,642,000	860,000	8,828,000	650,000
February.....	28,000	7,218,000	2,191,000	9,827,000	470,000
March.....	52,000	7,978,000	577,000	5,374,000	555,000

Foreign Agricultural Service Division. Compiled from Foreign Commerce and Navigation of the United States and official records of the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce.

TALLOW

Imports of tallow, which is also a beef product, commenced in September 1934 and rose to a peak of 33,000,000 pounds in May 1935.

Since that time imports have shown a definitely declining tendency, amounting to only 5.4 million pounds in March 1936.

BUTTER

Imports of butter were substantial during the first 6 months of 1935 but they were of very small volume during the last half of the year.

While the imports of butter in 1935 reached a relatively high level of 22,675,000 pounds, they did not equal the record imports of 23,741,000 pounds reached in 1923.

The imports of butter in the first 3 months of 1936 were 58 percent less than in the same months of 1935.

DRIED EGGS

Imports of egg products, chiefly dried eggs from China, were larger in 1935 than in any year since 1931 but were considerably smaller than in the years prior to 1931.

So far as 1935 is concerned these imports reached their peak in May and June.

This review of the principal agricultural import products shows clearly that imports are receding from the peaks reached in 1935 and in some cases are now of negligible proportions.

INSIGNIFICANT PROPORTION

While the imports of these products were larger in 1935 than in the immediately preceding years, they represented in most cases an insignificant proportion of the production of similar products in the United States.

A comparison of the imports of certain competitive products with our average production is shown in table 3.

TABLE 3.—Volume of certain agricultural imports compared to average production
[Average 1928-32 and year 1935]

Commodity	Unit of quantity	Production Average 1928-32 quantity	Imports			
			Average, 1928-32		1935	
			Quantity	Percent of average production	Quantity	Percent of average production
Grain:						
Corn.....	1,000 bushels	2,562,147	698	0.03	43,242	1.7
Wheat.....	1,000 bushels	820,570	127	.01	27,439	3.2
Oats.....	1,000 bushels	1,217,646	284	.02	10,107	.8
Barley.....	1,000 bushels	282,841	688	.2	13,413	4.7
Rye.....	1,000 bushels	38,655	18	.1	9,643	24.9
Meats:						
Beef, canned.....	1,000 pounds	-----	46,595	-----	76,309	-----
Beef and veal, fresh.....	1,000 pounds	-----	22,691	-----	8,757	-----
Beef, pickled, etc.....	1,000 pounds	-----	4,442	-----	1,472	-----
Total beef.....		16,884,616	143,621	2.1	201,002	3.0

¹ Includes full duty imports and imports unfit for human consumption.

² Grain plus malt converted to bushels of grain at the rate of 37.4 pounds of malt to 1 bushel of grain.

³ Estimated dressed weight of total United States beef and veal slaughter. Federally inspected slaughter was 67.7 percent of this figure.

⁴ Canned beef converted to meat equivalent at the rate of 2.5 pounds dressed meat to 1 pound canned.

TABLE 3.—Volume of certain agricultural imports compared to average production—Continued

Commodity	Unit of quantity	Production	Imports			
		Average 1928-32 quantity	Average, 1928-32		1935	
			Quantity	Percent of average production	Quantity	Percent of average production
Hogs.....	1,000 pounds.....		897		3,414	
Pork, fresh.....	1,000 pounds.....		3,088		3,923	
Hams, shoulders and bacon.....	1,000 pounds.....		2,319		5,297	
Pork, pickled, etc.....	1,000 pounds.....		1,750		1,274	
Total pork.....		\$ 9,270,000	\$ 7,830	0.1	\$ 13,055	0.1
Dairy products and eggs:						
Butter.....	1,000 pounds.....	2,152,160	2,560	.1	22,675	1.1
Casein.....	1,000 pounds.....	30,883	15,888	51.5	3,230	10.5
Cheese.....	1,000 pounds.....	489,055	68,742	14.1	48,933	10.0
Eggs.....	1,000 dozen.....	2,751,333	34,721	1.3	21,771	.8

¹ Estimated dressed weight, excluding lard, of total United States hog slaughter. Federally inspected slaughter was 63 percent of this figure.

² Hogs converted to meat equivalent at the rate of 100 pounds live weight to 75 pounds dressed weight.

³ Includes imports of frozen eggs converted at the rate of 7 pounds frozen to 6 dozen fresh and imports of dried eggs converted on the following bases: 1 pound of dried whole eggs to 3.56 pounds liquid; 1 pound dried yolk to 2.23 pounds of liquid; 1 pound dried albumen to 7.3 pounds liquid; 35 pounds liquid to 30 dozen eggs in the shell.

Foreign Agricultural Service Division, Bureau of Agricultural Economics.

PERCENTAGE SMALL

It will be noted, for instance, that our imports of corn in 1935, amounting to 43,242,000 bushels, represented only 1.7 percent of our average corn production during the period 1928 to 1932.

Last year's imports of oats amounted to eight-tenths of 1 percent of the average production, wheat 3.2 percent of our average wheat production, and barley and barley malt 4.7 percent of our barley production.

SHORT ON RYE

Rye is the only one of the grains the imports of which reached a substantial percentage of our average domestic production.

The proportion of imports in 1935 to average production was approximately 25 percent.

The reason for these relatively large imports of rye is to be found in the fact that in both 1933 and 1934 the rye crops in the United States were less than half of our average previous production.

These very short crops, coming at a time when the repeal of prohibition led to some increase in consumption, made it necessary for the United States to import substantial quantities of rye in order to satisfy our domestic requirements.

As previously indicated, the imports of rye have been negligible since our 1935 crop became available in July of last year.

Incidentally, the production of rye in the United States in 1935 was in excess of our domestic requirements, so that we now have an export surplus of this grain.

BEEF AND PORK

With respect to meat, the total imports of beef in 1935, most of which consisted of canned beef, represented only 3 percent of our average total federally inspected production of beef and veal.

The imports of pork represented only one-tenth of 1 percent of our average total inspected pork.

In fact, these pork imports were only 11.3 percent of our reduced exports of cured pork in 1935, excluding lard.

CHEESE AND BUTTER FOR 1935

Imports of butter in 1935 were substantially greater than the average imports in preceding years but they represented only 1.1 percent of our average production of butter in this country. Imports of cheese and casein in 1935 each repre-

sented about 10 percent of our average production. It will be noted, however, that imports of both of these items in 1935 were considerably below average.

Imports of egg products, chiefly dried eggs, in 1935 were much smaller than average, although they were larger than in immediately preceding years. The imports in 1935 represented about eight-tenths of 1 percent of the average egg production of the United States.

WHAT I HAVE SHOWN SO FAR

I have shown that there was a substantial increase in the imports of certain agricultural products in 1935, compared with the immediately preceding years, that these imports have shown a definite recession, and finally that they have, in practically all cases, represented an insignificant part of our domestic production. Now let us consider in more detail the relationship of the drought of 1934 and also of the agricultural-adjustment programs to this increase in agricultural imports.

WHAT THE DROUGHT HAD TO DO WITH IT

To understand the significance of the drought in relation to imports, it is necessary to know the extent to which our production in 1934 was reduced from normal. The drought of 1934 was the most widespread and serious in the history of all of the major crops in this country except cotton and tobacco.

The products principally affected were feeds and fodder. It has been estimated by the Bureau of Agricultural Economics that the drought of 1934 caused a reduction from average in our production of feed of 50,000,000 tons.

In other words, in order to have had a normal supply of feed during the latter half of 1934 and up until the crops of 1935 became available it would have been necessary to import 50,000,000 tons.

But, as a matter of fact, the United States, during the full 18 months from July 1934, when the effects of the drought first became apparent, until December 1935, when the 1935 corn crop became available, imported less than three and one-half million tons of all types of feeds and fodder, or only 7 percent of the shortage.

BEEF CATTLE AND CALVES

A similar situation exists with respect to the imports of livestock and livestock products.

Beef cattle may be taken as an example. The number of beef cattle and calves in the United States in January 1934 was estimated to be 36,000,000 head.

The number in January 1935 was estimated at 32,000,000 head.

This reduction of 4,000,000 head may be compared with our imports of beef cattle in 1935 of only 368,000 head.

In the case of imported beef, which consists principally of canned beef, the situation is much the same. The federally inspected slaughter of cattle and calves in the United States in 1934 produced six thousand seven hundred and twenty-seven million pounds of beef and veal, compared with five thousand two hundred and sixteen million pounds in 1935, a drop of about one thousand five hundred million pounds.

Figures for both years include provisional estimates of beef produced from relief slaughter. The imports of beef and veal in 1935, including canned beef on a dressed-weight basis, were just short of 200,000,000 pounds, or 13 percent of the reduction in our Federal slaughter between 1934 and 1935.

HOW DID A. A. A. AFFECT IMPORTS?

These are only a few of numerous examples that might be cited of the tremendous decrease in production of agricultural products in the United States resulting from the drought and of the relatively small part that imports played in making up this loss in production.

The question is frequently raised, however, as to the effect of the agricultural-adjustment programs on imports.

Many people who do not realize the overshadowing importance of the drought in reducing domestic supplies of food, feed, and livestock in 1934 and 1935 seem to be under

the impression that the imports have been a direct result of the agricultural-adjustment programs.

They are unable, as they put it, to see the justification of paying American farmers to reduce production and then permitting imports to come in to take the place of American products.

A MINOR FACTOR

First of all, it must be admitted that the adjustment programs, by helping to raise American farm prices, were to some extent a factor in making the American market more attractive to imports; but they were only a minor factor, since the reduction in production that may be attributed to the adjustment programs is very much less than the reduction that may be attributed to the low yields resulting from the drought.

Furthermore, there were no production-adjustment programs with respect to certain products, such as rye, barley, oats, dairy products, beef cattle, and eggs, the imports of which showed large increases.

These facts will be best brought out by an examination of individual products.

REDUCED PRODUCTION OF WHEAT

The United States production of wheat in the crop year 1934-35 was 497,000,000 bushels, a drop of 364,000,000 bushels from the annual average of 861,000,000 bushels for the 5-year period 1928 to 1932.

Of this reduction about 310,000,000 bushels were chargeable to the drought and 54,000,000 bushels to acreage reduction, in accordance with adjustment contracts under the Agricultural Adjustment Act.

WHEAT UNFIT FOR USE

Wheat imported into the United States for consumption in 1934-35 totaled 14,000,000 bushels, or only 5 percent of the loss caused by the drought.

These imports represented only 3 percent of the United States wheat production for the crop year.

Furthermore, of this total importation of 14,000,000 bushels, over 57 percent represented wheat unfit for human consumption brought into the country chiefly as feed for livestock in the drought-affected areas.

In the 1935-36 crop year, production of all wheat in the United States totaled 603,000,000 bushels, or 257,000,000 bushels less than the 5-year—1928-32—average.

The reduction in production during this crop year was also due primarily to unfavorable weather conditions and particularly to serious rust damage in the spring-wheat States.

Imports of wheat during the first 9 months of the crop year—July through March—amounted to 28,000,000 bushels.

AT LAST FARMERS ARE MAKING MONEY

In the last analysis, the most important phase of this whole import subject is the effect of these imports upon the income of American farmers. Are imports really coming into the country in such volume as to depress our prices and result in a serious decrease in farm income?

It has already been shown that the imports since 1934 represent, in most cases, a very small part of our domestic supply.

It is for this reason that in the vast majority of cases they have had no significant effect in depressing American farm prices.

The most that can be attributed to imports is that in certain cases such as, for example, butter, seasonal imports during the period when our butter supplies are shortest in the winter prevent prices of butterfat in this country from rising as much as they otherwise would.

In other words, the tariff of 14 cents a pound on butter is, under these circumstances, effective in maintaining American prices above world prices by substantially this amount.

One way of considering the significance of imports to farm income is to compare the value of the imports of competitive products year by year with the gross farm income of the United States for the same years.

TABLE 4.—United States competitive agricultural imports compared with domestic farm income

Year ended Dec. 31	Value		Value index (1921-30=100)	
	Gross income from farm production	Competitive agricultural imports ¹	Gross income from farm production	Competitive agricultural imports ¹
	Million dollars	Million dollars		
1921.....	8,927	739	82	79
1922.....	9,944	865	91	92
1923.....	11,041	1,105	101	118
1924.....	11,337	991	104	108
1925.....	11,968	1,016	109	109
1926.....	11,480	971	105	104
1927.....	11,616	994	106	106
1928.....	11,741	961	107	103
1929.....	11,941	1,017	109	109
1930.....	9,454	699	86	75
1931.....	6,968	446	64	48
1932.....	5,337	296	49	32
1933.....	² 6,406	³ 377	59	40
1934.....	² 7,266	³ 450	66	48
1935.....	² 8,110	³ 623	74	67

¹ Competitive agricultural imports include imports of agricultural products commercially produced in the United States or directly substituted to a significant extent for domestic agricultural products.

² Includes income from rental and benefit payments of \$278,000,000 for 1933, \$594,000,000 for 1934, and \$480,000,000 for 1935.

³ Imports for consumption.

Foreign Agricultural Service Division.

AMAZING GAIN TO FARMERS

The income of farmers in the United States in 1935, when the competitive agricultural imports were valued at \$623,000,000, was \$8,110,000,000.

The income of farmers in the United States in 1932, when competitive imports were valued at only \$296,000,000, was only \$5,337,000,000, the lowest in the recent history of this country.

The table also shows that in the years prior to the depression, when imports of competitive farm products were running at a total value in the neighborhood of \$1,000,000,000 a year, the income of the farmers of the United States was much larger, running between \$11,000,000,000 and \$12,000,000,000 a year.

In other words, the American farmer has been better off from the standpoint of total income in the years when competitive imports have been large than in the years when such imports have been small.

In the more prosperous years farm prices are high enough so that imports are attracted into the American market over the prevailing tariff wall.

In the years of very low farm income prices are so low in this country that the American market is not attractive to imports.

ANOTHER WAY OF LOOKING AT IT

Another way of considering the significance of imports is to relate the changes in volume of imports to the prices received by American farmers. Just as in the case of gross farm income, the prices received by farmers have been higher during periods of large imports than they were when imports were small.

A few specific examples will suffice to make this clear. The average farm price of wheat in the United States in both the calendar years 1934 and 1935 was 84 cents a bushel.

In those years the imports of wheat for consumption in the United States were approximately 8,000,000 and 17,000,000 bushels, respectively.

In 1933 the farm price of wheat was 67 cents a bushel and imports were 32,000 bushels.

* In 1932 the farm price was only 38 cents a bushel and imports amounted to the negligible figure of 3,000 bushels.

MORE MONEY FOR CORN

The average farm price of corn for the calendar year 1935 was 77 cents a bushel. Imports of corn in that year totaled 43,000,000 bushels. The farm price of corn in 1934 was 65 cents a bushel, and imports were 3,000,000 bushels.

In 1933, when the farm price of corn averaged only 38 cents per bushel, our imports of corn amounted to only 160,000 bushels.

BETTER PRICE FOR OATS

The farm price of oats in the United States during the crop year 1934-35, when imports amounted to approximately 16,000,000 bushels, was 48 cents a bushel.

But the average price to producers of oats thus far in the 1935-36 season, when imports have amounted to only 63,000 bushels, has been 28.5 cents a bushel.

RYE ALMOST DOUBLES IN PRICE

The farm price of rye was 71.3 cents a bushel during the marketing year 1934-35, when imports amounted to 11,000,000 bushels. The average farm price of rye thus far in 1935-36, when we have had practically no imports, has been only 38 cents a bushel.

The fundamental fact that should be borne in mind in considering imports in relation to farm income and farm prices is that prices received by American farmers for most of those drought-affected products are determined primarily by the domestic supply-and-demand situation, and that increased imports are a result of relatively high prices and decreased imports are a result of relatively low prices.

FALSE STATEMENT CORRECTED

I have seen statements that the increase in imports of competitive agricultural products during 1934 and 1935 has been due in large part to reductions in duties made in connection with reciprocal-trade agreements.

This simply is not true.

Generally speaking, there have been no changes in our tariff rates on the principal imported items.

In other words, reciprocal-trade agreements have had little, if anything, to do with the increase in imports.

The only trade agreements that have been signed up to the present time in connection with which the United States made any significant reductions whatever in duties on agricultural products are those with Cuba, Canada, and the Netherlands.

Of these three trade agreements, the only one that was in effect throughout the year was the one with Cuba.

TRADE AGREEMENT WITH CANADA

The trade agreement with Canada has been in effect only since January 1, 1936.

It is, therefore, obvious that this agreement could have had nothing to do with the increase in agricultural imports in 1935.

With respect to the possible effects of the agreement in causing larger imports into the United States during 1936 and future years, it is important to note that the duty reductions made on the Canadian agricultural products which would be likely to offer the most competition, namely, cattle, cream, and seed potatoes, were on only a limited quantity.

For example, the duty on beef cattle weighing 700 pounds or more was reduced on a quantity equivalent to three-fourths of 1 percent of our domestic slaughter of cattle and calves, namely, 155,799 head.

Incidentally, imports of cattle of this weight from Mexico or any other countries at the reduced rate have to come within a total of 155,799 head.

The duty on calves weighing 175 pounds or less was reduced on a quantity equivalent to one-fourth of 1 percent of our total annual slaughter of cattle and calves, or 51,933 head.

During the first 3 months of the operation of the agreement the imports of cattle weighing 700 pounds or more from both Canada and Mexico have totaled 44,031 head or 28 percent of the total customs quota.

The imports of calves have totaled 4,453 head or 8.5 percent of the total quota.

ONLY 1,293 GALLONS OF CANADIAN CREAM

In the case of cream the duty was reduced on a quantity of 1,500,000 gallons.

During the first 3 months of the agreement, however, the actual imports of cream have total only 1,293 gallons, which

indicates that in spite of the duty reduction the American market is not attractive to shippers of Canadian cream.

Cheese is the only important agricultural item the imports of which have shown any significant increase since the signing of the Canadian trade agreement.

It is true that imports of cheese in the period January through March were considerably larger than in the same period of the immediately preceding years and somewhat larger than in the corresponding months of years prior to 1930, when the same rate of 5 cents a pound applied.

But even though these imports showed some increase, they represented only 3.3 percent of the Cheddar cheese production in the United States during the same 3 months.

Incidentally, the total imports of all kinds of cheese from all countries were only 7 percent larger in the first 3 months of 1936 than in the corresponding months of 1935.

EXPORT MARKET GAINS

Against this possible small disadvantage of increased cheese imports must be set the very substantial gain in the exports of a considerable number of agricultural items from the United States to Canada, which may be directly attributed to reductions in duties made by Canada in connection with the trade agreement.

For example, our milled-rice exports to Canada totaled 2,746,000 pounds in the first 3 months that the trade agreement has been in effect, compared with 331,000 pounds in the same months of 1935, a gain of 730 percent.

Our exports of grapefruit to Canada totaled 191,000 boxes, compared with 139,000 boxes in January through March last year, a gain of 37 percent.

Exports of oranges to Canada amounted to 722,000 boxes during January through March of this year, compared with 568,000 boxes during the same months last year, a gain of 27 percent.

There were equally substantial gains in the exports of a large number of dried and canned fruits and nuts.

Our egg exports to Canada rose from the negligible figure of less than 7,400 dozen in January through March 1935 to 78,000 dozen in the same months of 1936. Exports of American cured pork to Canada—bacon, hams, and shoulders—totaled 118,000 pounds in the first 3 months of the year, compared with only 2,000 pounds in the same months of 1935.

At the same time the exports of cured pork to the rest of the world were 41 percent smaller than last year. The 1936 exports of other pickled and salted pork to Canada increased sharply, the figures for the first quarter being 151 percent larger than in 1935.

INCREASED BUYING POWER

Looking at the matter from the standpoint of farmers in the United States as a whole it seems clear that the gains in our exports of farm products to Canada much more than offset any losses resulting in increased imports of Canadian agricultural products into the United States. And beyond this, account must be taken of the increased purchasing power in the industrial sections of the country for such things as dairy products and beef, which results directly from our larger sales of manufactured goods to Canada under the trade agreement.

NOW YOU HAVE THE FACTS

Now that you have the facts you can see for yourself how much of the misleading propaganda by certain newspapers and by certain politicians is vicious, untrue, and intended to deceive you. The test of any policy in behalf of farmers or any other group is determined by the results. The fact that farmers are making more money today than at any previous time in years is the final answer to all the enemies of the Roosevelt administration who are trying to prejudice the farmers by substituting false propaganda for the truth. Do not let them fool you, Mr. Farmer! Make them stick to the facts!

MR. AND MRS. WILLIAM O'BRIEN

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 10565) for the relief

of Mr. and Mrs. William O'Brien, with a Senate amendment, and agree to the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "not otherwise appropriated" and insert "allocated by the President for the maintenance and operation of the Civilian Conservation Corps."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Wisconsin?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CENTRAL VALLEY WATER PROJECT AUTHORITY OF CALIFORNIA

The SPEAKER. Under the special order, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] for 10 minutes.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may revise and extend my remarks and include therein a report to the P. W. A. with reference to the Central Valley Water Project Authority of the State of California by B. W. Thoron, Assistant Finance Director of the P. W. A., dated July 26, 1934, and certain correspondence that I have had back and forth between the P. W. A. and the Secretary of the Interior.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, when we had the reclamation projects under consideration a week ago, I attempted to obtain from the Public Works Administration in time so that I might use it during the debate, the report of B. W. Thoron, the Assistant Finance Director of the P. W. A. on the Central Valley project. I have just procured permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD to include that report.

My office first asked for that report a week prior to that date, and on the 16th day of May, the Saturday prior to the date when the matter was coming up in the House, a letter was written to the P. W. A. Administrator, Hon. Harold L. Ickes, requesting it, because at that time they said that they would require such a letter. Not having received it on Tuesday, the day before the matter came up, I called Mr. Ickes myself and was promised that I would receive it. It arrived after my time had expired on the floor. Immediately thereafter I wrote the P. W. A. and complimented them on their efficiency in seeing that the documents did not arrive until it was too late to use them in the debate.

What does that report disclose with reference to this project? It discloses that the administration itself, in its own investigation from inside sources, did not have a proper basis for submitting such a proposition to the President or for making an allotment for it. It discloses that this director, after his investigation, said that the estimates of power revenues by the applicant, by the Federal Power Commission, and by the engineer examiner are widely at variance; that the dependable market for power does not appear to us to justify the estimates of revenue of the applicant, as it appears that there must be a very large development of the market for power to absorb all of the available power which may be developed in connection with the project. On the other hand, he states the use of water for power must be subordinated to the other requirements if the water is to be available as and when needed for the other purposes of the project. This means that there will be a large variation in the amount of water released from the so-called Kennett Reservoir, and that that is absolutely true, because the reservoir is so near the head of the Sacramento Basin and the water stored must be used to equalize the flow from the tributary streams entering the Sacramento below the reservoir, that it will result in drawing down the water level of the reservoir in such way as to materially affect the operating head.

As to the plan of financing, it discloses that it does not appear that any estimate of assured revenues can be made which would warrant the conclusion that a loan for the

construction of this project, payable solely from the net revenues derived therefrom, would be reasonably secured.

The project, if economically sound and carried to completion, would be of far-reaching benefit to the whole State of California, and more particularly to the counties which will receive its benefits, as well as to the particular lands directly affected. It therefore seems entirely reasonable to suggest that the cost of the project and the responsibility for financing it should be apportioned in some way commensurate with the benefits.

The report further states that a conservative estimate of reasonably assured revenues could be used as a basis for issuing a limited amount of revenue bonds to finance the plans at cost. The report further states that, in addition, proper account has not been taken of surplus crops that are now available and the question as to whether we should enter into that kind of reclamation project at a time when we have a surplus of the crops which that particular project would raise.

It appears from this report—and the entire report will be in the RECORD, under my permission to extend remarks—that this is absolutely being entered upon without regard to the question of its economic necessity and the economic efficiency of bringing more land into cultivation at such a time as this.

I am not surprised, in view of the manner in which allotments are being made by the P. W. A. and by other outfits in connection with the Government out of relief funds, that this allotment has been made so far as it has been made by the P. W. A. and other governmental authorities. It is so ridiculous that we should spend all this money at this time, a time when we have such a surplus of all these crops that are raised in this valley, further to develop irrigation projects. It appears in this report that it is absolutely unnecessary to go into such a large-scale project to take care of land already under cultivation, and that there can be no justification for it except as new lands are brought under irrigation. Those people who have irrigation projects would be fairer to the country and to themselves if they would not come here with such outlandish and such ridiculous projects; and I hope the Congress will have all these things in mind when they come to vote on these matters again.

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. GEARHART. Does the gentleman understand that there are between 400,000 and 500,000 acres in the upper San Joaquin Valley in a high condition of productivity which, unless they receive water from the building of this project, will revert to the condition of the desert and become utterly worthless?

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I refuse to yield further; I have not the time. I will tell the gentleman the situation. The situation is that it is absolutely unnecessary to take care of the lands that are under high cultivation to have this great big expensive project. A few things could be done in the upper San Joaquin Valley that would entirely provide for and take decent care of these lands that are under cultivation; but there is absolutely no excuse for this big project, and the reports of the engineers all the way through sustain this viewpoint without conflict, stating that it is absolutely unnecessary to have this expense lay-out in order to take care of the lands already under cultivation.

Mr. GEARHART. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will yield further, I may say to the gentleman from New York that I live within a few miles of the land I just described, and I know, personally, that no definite plan has been offered by any engineer of consequence, or any engineer whose opinion is worthy of consideration, for the saving of these parching lands of the upper San Joaquin other than through the utilization of some, if not all, of the units of the Central Valley project.

Mr. TABER. Does the gentleman recognize the State engineer of California as an authority? He has studied the project and has demonstrated it clearly in his report.

Mr. GEARHART. I recognize Mr. Edward Hyatt, the State engineer of California, as the most able, consistent, and eloquent advocate of the Central Valley project in the

United States today. We are in constant consultation with him. You cannot cite one in whom we have greater confidence.

Mr. TABER. And he has said that what the gentleman has asked is not necessary. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

The SPEAKER. Under the special order the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CARPENTER] is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. CARPENTER. Mr. Speaker and Members of the House, I trust that what I am about to say will not be misunderstood or will not seem out of place. I assure you I am most sincere. My service here the last 4 years has become such a vital part of my life that for some reason or other I do not feel I can sever my connections with this honorable body without expressing myself in these very few remarks before I leave.

While I have not served in Congress very long—there are many who have served so long they are considered veterans—I have been here and taken part in the affairs of our National Government during one of the most critical periods of our Nation's history. It has been my pleasure to have labored with, to have been personally acquainted with and met men and women who are destined to go down in history as our great leaders.

It has been a very great pleasure to have served with you, my colleagues, during these critical years. And while we may have had our differences in regard to legislative matters, you have always been so very courteous and considerate of me at all times.

I have never before witnessed men and women for the most part with such an earnest desire to serve their fellow men—so willing to give every matter presented to them their serious consideration or who had such sympathetic understanding of the needs and desires of the people of this country. I have never seen individuals to such an extent dedicate all their energies and even their very lives to those they represent, and to the general welfare. Would that I had the ability and the skill of a great artist to paint the wonderful battle scenes of the great struggles that go on here daily and to truly portray the heroes who patriotically, earnestly, and conscientiously carry on in these very chambers from day to day, whether they be leaders or merely buck privates in the rear ranks.

No one can appreciate the many duties and responsibilities that go with the office of Congressman until he has been elected to that high office. There is great joy and honor in attaining such position. After it has been reached the road is rough and rocky, with many pitfalls, and the woods are full of relentless savages. Honest and conscientious actions can be so misconstrued as to make them appear in an opposite light. Unfavorable news items, no matter how unfair, or whatever the motive, leave a wound that never heals.

Why do men aspire to such undertakings, you may ask me, if they have to undergo such strain, such hardships, and such humiliation? They seek the office. No one compels them to do so—it is voluntary on their part—and having attained it, why do they cling to it? It is that human ambition engendered in the spark of life that makes one desire to live, and in desiring to live to desire others to live. Living is not merely existing. It comprises those attributes which have ever been dominate among human beings—life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness as pronounced at the birth of our Nation, to secure which it is written that governments are instituted among men. It is irresistible, like the force of a glacier that sweeps all before it till the course is completed even out to the sea.

May our descendants never arrive at that period when they no longer desire leadership, or having attained the same they are not willing to make the sacrifices that go with it, as well as to enjoy its honors.

It is, therefore, with great reluctance that I leave these halls at this time. I have enjoyed every minute of my stay. I say again in conclusion it has been a great privilege to have been among you. Your political affiliations have made no difference to me, so that you were sincerely working for

the best interest of those you represent and the best interest of our great country as a whole. When the Seventy-fourth Congress is declared adjourned sine die, may I extend to each and every one of you my best wishes and a fond adieu. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 3 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Ohio yield for that purpose?

Mr. YOUNG. I yield.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I am sure I voice the sentiments of the entire membership of the House when I say that we have learned with very deep regret of the determination of the gentleman from Kansas voluntarily to retire from Congress. He has served here with us for 4 years, and during that period of service he has been a useful Member of this body. He has been modest, but able and indefatigable in the discharge of his duties as a Representative of his own district and also as a Representative of the entire country.

We regret very much the prospect of continuing our service without his presence. I am sure all of us extend to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CARPENTER] as he retires from this House the wish of great happiness in private life, and he carries with him the assurances of the profound esteem, respect, and affection of all Members of the House of Representatives. [Applause.]

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker and Members, the Fourth Congressional District of Kansas, which has been represented for 4 years by my congenial and able colleague, RANDOLPH CARPENTER, is the middle district of the State. It is bounded by five of the other six districts. It includes the Flint Hills, the prairie-grass grazing country, with the rich valleys along the streams. To the north and the east of his district is the corn and the alfalfa section, to the west and south the great wheat region.

RANDOLPH CARPENTER is a native son. He is a lawyer, and a son of a distinguished lawyer, a World War soldier with distinction, and the head of a delightful family. His grasp of legislative matters has been comprehensive, and he has the fine, quiet courage to follow his convictions. He is doing the unusual and remarkable thing of retiring voluntarily. To us he is the inscrutable. However, since he made his decision he has exhibited no evidence of regret.

He belongs to the opposite party from mine, and his withdrawal increases my party's chance to rerepresent the district. But, laying aside all those things, being our honest selves for a moment, we regret his going. He has been a credit to the fine traditions of our State, and our agricultural people will remember him as having been an active and true friend.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. Young] is recognized for 3 minutes.

THE TOWNSEND PLAN AND OLD-AGE SECURITY

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. Speaker, the Townsend plan is just another chain-letter racket. Nickels and dimes were taken from credulous old people for the benefit of Clements, Townsend, and racketeers who then lived in newly acquired luxury. That was cruel and uncalled for. Townsend plan leaders claimed to welcome a congressional investigation. Then Dr. F. E. Townsend, after a showing had been made of use of the mails to defraud by his organization, contemptuously refused to answer questions. He was a contumacious witness. He should be punished for contempt. That very night the entire Townsend old-age organization of 75, occupying 13 offices in Washington, cleaned out the offices of files and furniture and, like thieves in the night, stealthily stole away. Dr. Townsend claimed that the investigating Congressmen were persecuting him. He declined to answer further questions and walked out. He said the House of Representatives was unfriendly and unfair. Then, when

the House of Representatives yesterday voted to refer the contempt charges to the United States attorney of the District of Columbia for investigation by that official with a view toward prosecution upon contempt charges and an impartial trial in a court of justice, Dr. Townsend said:

The House of Representatives was afraid to bring me before it for an open discussion of this notorious case.

He is a charlatan, a faker, a racketeer, a fraud. [Applause.]

The Townsend plan has become the cruelest hoax ever perpetrated upon our fathers and mothers. The entire scheme is so fantastic—the taxation feature is so burdensome, so cowardly and cruel—that many worthy people who now believe will eventually meet with bitter disappointment. This is unnecessary and uncalled for. It is most reprehensible. Conscienceless agitators and demagogic politicians may thrive momentarily by espousing this phantasmagoric plan claiming to give \$200 per month to every elderly individual. Their ascendancy will be brief and their downfall sudden and certain.

The Townsend plan provides for money to be taken from wage earners, producers, and salaried people by a tax of 2 percent upon all business transactions plus a slight increase in inheritance, gift, and income taxes. This money is turned over to elderly people, regardless of need, to force its expenditure within 30 days "to keep a constant demand for production and consumption" and to take care of the needy aged.

Of 127,000,000 people in this country, 10,000,000 or more would seek these old-age annuity payments. The annual cost would be \$24,000,000,000, plus the tremendous expense of administration, if every elderly individual were to be paid \$200 per month. This would be equivalent to an added tax of \$190 per year for each man, woman, and child in the United States. A man earning \$100 per month and having a wife and two children would pay \$760 in added taxes. At present the American people are overburdened with taxes. The average annual per-capita tax of every individual in our country is now \$122.

There are already too many Government employees. Under the Townsend plan there would necessarily be a vast increase. Unfortunately the McGroarty bill (H. R. 7154) provides that the proceeds from the transaction tax shall first pay the cost of administration before anything whatever is paid to elderly people. I personally do not believe in bureaucrats first.

Supposing, instead of pensioning 10,000,000 men and women our Government would employ that additional number or increase the standing Army to that number, paying every soldier of the 10,000,000 \$200 per month, requiring the expenditure of that salary within 30 days. Would that restore prosperity? Or would it bankrupt the Nation?

Prudence in the expenditure of this money is not within the theory of the plan. What is the opinion of Dr. Townsend as to the necessity of prudently spending money? When before the Ways and Means Committee he was interrogated by a member of the committee, as follows:

Mr. HILL. He could not go out and squander it in order to get rid of it, so that he may be eligible to receive \$200 the next month?

Dr. TOWNSEND. We do not care what he does with it. That is immaterial. Let him have carte blanche. Let him buy whisky with it if he wants to kill himself off as quickly as he chooses. That is immaterial. It is commerce—business—that we want in the country. We are not going to regulate people's morals in the least when we give them money to spend.

Mr. HILL. Suppose a husband and wife qualify to receive this pension. They would be receiving \$400 per month. Let us say they have a family of grown-up children. Would it be permissible for those children to live with them and be supported from the provisions supplied with this pension money in the home?

Dr. TOWNSEND. Why not? Why not let elders buy commodities and give to their children if they like? That is immaterial.

All taxes are burdensome. The transaction tax is a multiple sales tax. Such a tax is heartless and cruel in its operation. Childhood, youth, sickness, poverty, and misfortune do not escape it. I favor liberal old-age pensions. I consider a transaction tax atrocious. Nearly 50,000,000 men and women who work for wages and salaries, and their

dependents, the farmers, middle-class people, and the poor must bear its burdens. Every tax imposed upon producers, upon industry, and business transactions adds to the cost of producing and distributing products and must be paid by the consumer. The farmer would be a chief victim of the transaction tax. He buys and sells out of proportion to his net income. Workingmen and children would be sufferers from the Townsend plan. Prices of necessities would increase much more than wages of workers, and even from the low wages would be deducted this transaction tax. Young and middle-aged parents and their small children would feel the pinch of restricted earning power under the Townsend plan. It is cruel and unconscionable to apply a multiple transaction sales tax upon the food and clothing of 36,000,000 children under 15 years of age. We must not decrease the opportunity for our children nor make their lot harder. The last place we should send the tax collector is into the homes of young men and women who are bringing up the future citizens of this Nation. Unfortunately the Townsend plan makes no provision whatever to raise wages corresponding with increased prices of commodities.

This depression has been prolonged because of the vast load of taxes and interest charges. The Townsend plan provides for a universal tax, a tax to raise a greater sum than was ever before collected in the same length of time anywhere in the world. The alleged benefits of the plan are speculative. The burden of the tax is definite, certain, and unescapable. No such burdensome tax has ever been proposed for the poor since the French Revolution. The real burden of the tax would be passed on to the workers in the form of higher prices. This, in effect, would further reduce wages already reduced by the transaction tax.

The proper administration of the plan would require a Government check-up every month to learn whether or not each beneficiary has spent the money given him and the amount of the individual income, if any, which should be deducted from his \$200 pension. As there are over 10,000,000 eligibles scattered throughout the country, it would require an army of snoopers, sneaks, spies, informers, supervisors, collectors, and bureaucrats to supervise its administration.

If our people establish a practice of using their political power to vote themselves pensions, regardless of need, then we are cultivating an appetite that is insatiable. The demand will grow and grow. Already it is suggested that the pensionable age be reduced to 55 years and that several other million beneficiaries be brought within the plan. If 10,000,000 people can live in idleness off others, why not 20,000,000?

About 350 years ago, while Elizabeth was Queen, somebody thought of the poorhouse. Since then we have found better ways of doing everything. We have exchanged the quill pen for the fountain pen and printing press; the candle for the electric light; the horse for the railroad, automobile, and airplane. Stagecoaches, tallow dips, flintlock muskets are gone, never to return. Nevertheless, we still tolerate the poorhouse. We care for our needy aged by methods in vogue in 1588.

After years of depression this problem is particularly acute. Savings of thousands of aged people have been wiped out, despite the fact that they providently and thriftily saved for their future. They are destitute. Their sons and daughters, lacking jobs in many instances, cannot help. Younger people and the middle aged may never be able to accumulate sufficient for their own old age. Certainly they are not able to adequately provide for their aged and infirm parents. This depression, like war, leaves its toll for future generations to pay. The question is, Shall we provide for our aged extravagantly and cruelly in poorhouse, or humanely, economically, and scientifically by old-age pensions?

Old-age pensions provide an open road for happiness and contentment for men and women who have through no fault of their own beheld the savings of a lifetime swept away as a result of ill-founded trust and abiding faith in big city bankers, in manipulated insurance companies, in exploiting building-and-loan associations, or have been swindled in any manner through the connivance of others, or who have by

reason of economic conditions been unable to lay aside sufficient for the rainy day that awaits us all. Local communities now overburdened, relatives now unduly burdened caring for the less fortunate, and county poorhouses will be displaced. A new era is at hand. The aged and infirm will face security and contentment instead of uncertainty, humiliation, and misery.

The need for old-age security legislation is largely due to the congestion and intensity of modern industrial processes. Either aged people, in honorable poverty, must be supported by private charity or by society. I favor old-age security legislation because it is the duty of the Government, and also because the reliance upon private charity is an unequal and insecure dependence for men and women who have earned the right to live their few remaining years in modest independence and enjoy repose.

The hope we all cherish is an old age free from care and want. To that end people toil patiently and live closely, seeking to save something for the day when they can earn no more. And yet the same fate awaits the majority. In the life of the worker there are weeks, often months, of enforced idleness, weeks of unavoidable sickness, losses from swindling, and then as age creeps on there is a constantly declining capacity to earn, until at 60 many find themselves destitute. There is no more pitiful tragedy than the lot of the worker who has struggled all his life to gain a competence and who at 60 faces the poor house. The black slave knew no such tragedy as this. It is a tragedy reserved for the free worker in the wealthiest and greatest nation on earth.

There is nothing radical about the old-age pension idea, though personally I do not fear being termed a "radical." The word "radical" is derived from the Latin word meaning "root." We ought to go to the roots of our social and economic troubles. As a matter of fact, payment of old-age pensions by the State or National Government involves no new policy nor any innovation of principle. In 1913, as a member of the General Assembly of Ohio, I participated in the enactment of Ohio's first mothers' pension law. Before that time the State had dealt in haphazard fashion with children of destitute widows. Children were sent to children's homes and the mother to work. This blighted the lives of children and brought misery to the mother. Instead of cruel separations of mothers and children, we now have the enlightened system of mothers' pensions, with regular payments to mothers to take care of their children. The family is kept together. Furthermore, the cost to the State is less. No State that has adopted mothers' pensions has returned to the old inhuman methods. I urge the same principle for the needy aged who, after a lifetime of industry and struggle, at 60 becomes in need of assistance from the Government or from public or private charities. It is time to free white hair and wrinkled brows from dread and anxiety. Instead of "over the hill to the poorhouse", the Government should lend a helping hand in a scientific and adequate manner to our deserving and needy aged as they go down the sunset side of life.

Private charities, bread lines, and soup kitchens must not be the only answers of American intelligence and sense of justice to the problem of unemployment and indigent old age. Out of the hardships of this depression when millions of people sought work which they could not find, let us hope that a better future may come for aged men and women whose condition is desperate even in the best of times and through no fault of their own.

The truth is that if the Townsend plan means \$200 per month for every elderly individual of 60 or over then there is no bill pending in the Congress that would provide such pensions. The size of the monthly payment to elderly individuals depends, under the McGroarty bill, H. R. 7154, on the amount of money the taxes produce after cost of administration has been deducted. Of course, this may be very fine for the bureaucrats and the administrators of the plan, but it would not be so good for the elderly people who are dependent. How can we say to the people we

represent that we are providing old-age security for them unless we definitely write into the statute laws some substantial minimum as a certain amount that every worthy elderly person of this country will receive? Under this McGroarty bill, which is the latest Townsend plan, the annuity payment to the elderly people that we represent may be from nothing up. Of course, as a sop and because they have been talking so much about \$200 per month, the bill states that in no event shall the payment exceed \$200 per month, but everyone knows that after the cost of administration has been deducted, the payment will be but a fraction of that amount.

H. R. 3977, Mr. McGROARTY, was abandoned by its author. He stated that he would not vote for this bill.

H. R. 7154, Mr. McGROARTY, clearly states that the pensions shall be "in such amount not exceeding \$200 per month." The pension may be from nothing up. Unfortunately no minimum is provided.

Townsend-plan leaders in Congress estimate the 2-percent transaction sales tax might provide sufficient money to enable old-age-pension payments to provide \$50 per month. Members who have studied the bill carefully estimate the amount would not exceed \$28 per month. This is less than is provided in the Social Security Act of 1935.

Townsend-plan leaders frequently refer to Dr. Robert Doane, a political economist, as favoring the Townsend plan. Dr. Doane stated before the Ways and Means Committee of the House of Representatives as follows:

MR. FULLER. You have studied the Townsend bill, have you not? DR. DOANE. I have not. I have never read the Townsend bill.

MR. FULLER. You know that the general purpose of it is to pay \$200 a month to every person over the age of 60? [Referring to H. R. 3977, Mr. McGROARTY, since abandoned.]

DR. DOANE. Yes; I know that.

MR. FULLER. As an economist, do you think that this Government would stand that financial strain and burden?

DR. DOANE. Not at the present level of income and the present rate of production; no.

MR. FULLER. That is all (p. 1119 of official record of hearings).

Since that time, Dr. Doane has testified that the scheme is fantastic, would result in the wildest inflation, and that the cost of bread and other necessities would skyrocket. He said:

The Townsend plan for raising the required revenue is not only decidedly not feasible, but is filled with formidable danger to the entire American fiscal, social, and economic structure. . . . Any heavy tax on mass consumption always checks and lowers the consumption powers of labor. As a matter of common-sense fact, known to every man or woman possessed of any knowledge whatsoever of economics, it would be utterly impossible to raise any such sum proposed by the Townsend plan under any form of taxation. A 2-percent tax on all transactions is an entirely different thing once it works its way through the entire fabric of a nation's economic life. Through the sheer multiple effect of its cumulative action, as it is passed on as a cost factor from one transaction to another, it really becomes a 50-percent tax upon the wealth and income of the consumer.

He added:

The Townsend plan, if put in effect, can only serve to vastly increase unemployment.

Many thoughtful individuals believe that a 2-percent transaction tax would prove ruinous to every small-business man in this country. They believe that it would be impossible for the independent merchant, for example, to compete with the chain-store system, because the independent merchant buys his merchandise through a system that requires many transactions, with the result that there would be multiple taxes; whereas the chain-store system has a more simplified system of distribution that avoids many transactions and would have a decided advantage over the independent merchant. It is stated that large industrial organizations that own the complete unit of production would have a decided advantage over small organizations. I do not want great corporations to become larger and more powerful. I personally believe that small business institutions have done much to develop the progress of our country.

Mr. Stuart A. Rice, Acting Chairman of the United States Central Statistical Board, states that in 1934 transactions

subject to a 2-percent transaction tax amounted to only \$105,000,000,000, and that a 26-percent transaction sales tax would be necessary to provide pensions of \$200 per month.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MORITZ], a member of the "McGroarty bill 7154, the Townsend-plan steering committee", said in the House of Representatives, January 15, 1936:

Dr. Townsend has stated before the Ways and Means Committee that if the age of 60 is not practicable to start out with, he would be willing to start at the age of 75. He has told me personally the reason he has advocated \$200 per month is that no politician can come along and raise the "ante."

Congressman MORITZ is one of the Townsend plan leaders in Congress. (See CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 428, Jan. 15, 1936, issue.)

On January 17, the gentleman from Montana [Mr. MONAGHAN], chairman of this steering committee, stated:

I wish to say that I have not defended the sales tax in any speech on this floor. I have condemned it. There is a vast difference between a sales tax and a transaction tax, the one proposed in the revised McGroarty bill. (See CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 615.)

Dr. F. E. Townsend flatly contradicts this statement. Read page 1016 of the report of the Senate Finance Committee (Feb. 18, 1935). Following are excerpts from Dr. Townsend's testimony:

Senator BARKLEY. So it is really a sales tax.

Dr. TOWNSEND. There is a distinction, but there is very little difference. A sales tax has to necessarily be a tax on a transaction. All taxes on transactions of a financial nature are sales taxes.

Senator BARKLEY. So it is a distinction without a difference.

Dr. TOWNSEND. Well, the public conception of a sales tax is a limited-transactions tax. That is the only difference.

Senator BARKLEY. The transactions tax would be unlimited; it would apply to all transactions involving sales?

Dr. TOWNSEND. That is what we propose to do.

Senator BARKLEY. The name is changed in order to get away from the term "sales tax"?

Dr. TOWNSEND. That is all.

The Townsend plan to pay \$200 per month to every individual of 60 years of age or older is really an emotional adventure in the field of economics. It is the capitalization of a wish. It has nothing to do with reality. If \$400 a month to every elderly couple of 60 years will bring about recovery and prosperity, why not demand \$1,000 per month for each elderly couple and so bring about a boom?

It is unconscionable and despicable for any man to elevate himself into public office by capitalizing upon the suffering and the credulity of old people who are in need. Yet there are individuals who are deceiving thousands of worthy old people into believing that they will receive \$200 per month. Some of these so-called Townsend leaders have been living in luxury at the expense of impoverished but trusting elderly people. The cruel part of this performance is that a few unworthy men will deceive worthy elderly men and women, secure dimes and quarters from them, and secure their trust and confidence for a time, and perhaps some will win election to high public office.

This Townsend plan which is being urged is thoroughly and completely unconstitutional. The pitiful part of the whole thing is that the proponents are not even proposing to repeal the social-security law; but they are, in fact, greatly impeding the progress of proper old-age security laws. The Supreme Court would hold unconstitutional the imposition of a transaction tax upon the wage earners of our country for the benefit of a small group—about 8 percent of the people.

The Townsend plan, in fact, is not an old-age-pension plan. It is a scheme for further increasing the burdens of the poor. A 2-percent tax on every transaction will increase the cost of the necessities of life tremendously. Salaried men and wage earners would not only pay taxes upon their small salaries, but they would pay, under this scheme, a tax upon anything they buy. Nothing escapes. They must pay taxes on the food and the clothes they buy for the children, medicine for the sick, milk for the babies, all to enable an elderly couple over 60 years of age to receive \$4,800 per year. Ten million persons in this country of 60

years or over would be beneficiaries of this plan as long as it lasted. Exclusive of the cost of the administration, which would be tremendous, an amount sufficient to pay elderly people \$200 per month each is more than six times the present normal annual revenue of the Federal Government from all sources of taxation.

The tax on transactions is a tax on every step of the processing, transportation, and sale of commodities, as well as a tax on all business transactions of every kind. On many articles 2 percent would be collected 12 times or more. Consider a loaf of bread. The farmer who grows the wheat would pay 2 percent in selling it to the grain elevator; the railroad that carries it to the elevator pays another tax; when a flour mill buys the wheat a tax is paid again; the miller is assessed another 2 percent when he sells the flour to a baker; and the railroad that carries it to the baker pays; the trucking is another transaction, and so on. The final buyer, who proposes to eat the bread, will find that its price has gone way up.

The farmers of our country under the Townsend plan would be forced to submit monthly reports showing every transaction they made—every basket of eggs sold, every quart of grain marketed, every coop of chickens taken to the produce house, each load of wheat sold to the grain dealer. On each transaction the farmer would have to pay a 2-percent sales tax. I represent all the farmers of Ohio. I would never vote such a burden on my constituents. Think of the wage earner paying this enormous tax on the clothing he buys for his family and upon every morsel of food he places on his table. This is the heaviest, most burdensome, most outrageous pyramided sales tax ever proposed to any Congress. It is amazing that many people have been so deceived that they are urging Congress to tax themselves out of existence. The McGroarty bill does not provide an economic panacea. It does not give a short cut to prosperity. It does not answer the prayers of our aged. It proposes an unbearable transaction sales tax which, if forced upon the people of the United States, would only pay a pension amounting to approximately \$28 per month.

In 1934 the entire national income was approximately \$50,000,000,000. The Townsend plan would take more than 40 percent of it. A man on a salary of \$40 a week would contribute more than \$16 of his pay every week—not directly, of course, but indirectly through the transactions tax.

On the basis of current income it simply cannot be done. It is impossible. The rainbow in the sky is too far beyond the horizon. Through the medium of indirect taxes the \$40-a-week man will contribute \$16 a week, which will be given to an elderly person to spend. The buying power of the \$40 man will be reduced accordingly. The cost of the scheme will fall almost entirely on those who are least able to afford it—on the people who live on wages and small salaries. The income of this class is now consumed almost wholly in living expenses, and it is they who will have to bear the heavy load of the tax on all transactions.

Why stop at \$200 per month? Anyone who believes it would work at \$200 would believe it still better at \$300. So, in order to get Dr. Townsend's following away from him, a political demagogue would only have to raise his ante.

Wage earners and salaried employees would suffer a lower standard of living because their purchasing power would decline, due to higher living costs, and 2 percent of their earnings would be regularly taken away by the tax.

The Townsend plan would drastically redistribute the national income, but at the expense of millions of wage earners, salaried employees, farmers, and owners of small businesses.

If prosperity could be restored by taxing 92 percent of the population in order to give money to the other 8 percent to spend, would it not be better to give this money to young married people? They have greater obligations and responsibilities. They have homes to build and children to rear and educate.

Those who advocate the Townsend plan include bank transactions. Therefore, every check issued, every withdrawal, would cost 2 percent additional. Such a tax would destroy our banking structure.

The total business transactions, exclusive of bank transactions, during 1935 amounted to less than \$500,000,000,000. In fact, a sound economist estimated that the total business transactions in 1933 amounted to \$250,000,000,000 and that the total for 1935 was much under \$500,000,000,000.

Furthermore, if 10,000,000 men and women, or 1,000,000 men and women, over 60 years of age were taken from their jobs and younger people given these same jobs, how does it help to restore prosperity by substituting one group of unemployed for another?

Common sense, social vision, and an intention to do justice to our elderly people dictate that our energies should be applied in the coming years to liberalizing and making effective the beneficent provisions of the Social Security Act of 1935. Old-age pensions should commence at the age of 60. They should be adequate to provide real security for those who go down the sunset side of life.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAHON] is recognized for 3 minutes.

JAPANESE-AMERICAN TRADE

Mr. MAHON. Mr. Speaker, during this session of Congress I have heard this administration repeatedly denounced for its trade policy with Japan by members of the minority party. The Secretary of State is held up to scorn and ridicule, and a casual reader of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD would be led to believe that Japan has overrun our Nation with cheap goods, and outgeneraled the American businessman, intimidated the State Department, and routed the Tariff Commission and the President. This is far from the truth.

The truth is, last year we sold Japan \$203,000,000 worth of American goods and bought from Japan only \$153,000,000 worth of goods. By far the largest item in our purchases from Japan was raw silk, which we, of course, do not produce. The truth is that Japan is our best customer in the world for raw cotton. For years Japan has bought more than a million and a half bales of raw cotton per year from us. Last year she bought 1,518,000 bales of cotton from us for \$98,587,000. The truth is that Japan is the third best customer in the world for American goods. The truth is that during each year of the Roosevelt administration we have sold much more American goods to Japan than Japan has sold to us. During the past 3 years we have sold \$156,000,000 more goods to Japan than Japan has sold to us. The truth is that during the administrations of the Republican Presidents Hoover, Coolidge, and Harding, Japan flooded us with goods, we buying from Japan each year during those administrations many millions of dollars in goods in excess of our sales to Japan. During the 4 Hoover years of 1929, 1930, 1931, and 1932, the value of Japanese sales to us exceeded our sales to Japan to the extent of \$336,000,000.

The truth is that for the first time in 50 years we have a so-called favorable balance of trade with Japan. When I consider the excess of our purchases from Japan over our sales to Japan during the former Republican administrations and the fact that for the first time in history we sell Japan far more than she sells us during this administration, I find myself wholly unable to concur in the attacks made on this administration by certain Republican critics.

Oh, but it is said by a Member of the minority party in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 28, 1936, that, though we sell large quantities of raw products to Japan, Japan fabricates the great majority of the products we sell her and ships them back to us. This is extremely and unpardonably inaccurate.

This brings me to a brief consideration of our textile purchases from Japan. As heretofore stated, last year we sold Japan 1,518,000 bales of raw cotton. Japan shipped back to us in textiles and cotton products of all kinds the equivalent of 17,000 bales of cotton. Japan failed to ship back to us in fabricated products 1,501,000 bales of cotton of the aggregated weight of about 750,500,000 pounds. Of course, if we compare bales of cotton we sell to Japan to yards of cloth we buy from Japan, we might mislead those who do not know that a bale of cotton weighs 500 pounds and represents hundreds of yards of cotton cloth.

Mr. Speaker, I do not advocate the importation of cotton textiles from Japan. I much regret that any cotton textiles are imported from Japan. But as long as we can sell Japan more than a million and a half bales of cotton per year and buy back from her only about 17,000 bales of cotton per year in goods, I can see no cause for hysteria.

We have got to sell our cotton somewhere, and I will not be one to endeavor to drive away the best foreign customer the Texas cotton farmer has left.

But it is pointed out with alarm that the importation of certain textiles from Japan has increased several hundred percent within the last year. That is bad, but with the increase we still receive in textiles and cotton goods from Japan the small comparative amount which I have indicated.

Japan's export of cotton cloth to the United States last year amounted to less than 2 percent of the Japanese export of cotton textiles. According to Secretary Hull, imports of countable cotton cloths from Japan in 1935 were equivalent to about one-half of 1 percent of the total yardage of American production.

We export more cotton cloth than we import, but Japan is decidedly the largest cotton-textile exporting nation in the world, with England in second place. It is true that the New England textile manufacturers cannot compete in foreign markets with Japan for reasons that are well known. This is regrettable, but it is not the fault of the southern cotton farmer. Most certainly it is not the fault of this administration.

May I quote the following very striking and encouraging statement of March 9, 1936, by the Bureau of Agricultural Economics of the Department of Agriculture:

Domestic cotton consumption in December (1935) is reported by the Bureau of the Census at about 498,000 running bales. This is 2 percent less than consumption in November, but nearly 20 percent greater than consumption in December 1934 and the largest consumption for the month since 1928. Consumption in January amounted to about 591,000 bales, which was nearly 8 percent greater than last year, and the highest for the month since 1929. Consumption for the 6 months ended January 31 of 3,007,000 bales is the highest since the same 6-month period ended January 31, 1930. Mill activity during both December and January and the first half of February has been at a level about equal to the 1922 to 1927 level, inclusive, according to the New York Cotton Exchange. * * *

The mercenary critics of our Japanese trade policy should not be ungrateful for the improvement made in our domestic textile trade during this administration. They should be willing to look at the whole picture and note that for the first time in history the value of our exports to Japan exceed the value of our imports from Japan. However, this alert administration, in its endeavor to further assist the domestic textile industry, has within the last few days increased the tariff on certain Japanese textiles an average of 42 percent.

Mr. Speaker, the Republican tariff policy "bottled up" American agriculture, deprived us of our foreign markets, did irreparable injury to the cotton farmer, and did a great deal, directly and indirectly, to stop the commerce of the nations, and thereby impeded world progress. This administration, in this respect, has performed no miracles and has made some mistakes, but on the whole our foreign and domestic trade has increased and the American farmer and businessman can feel and see at least a little ray of hope.

CELEBRATION OF THE BICENTENNIAL OF THE BIRTH OF PATRICK HENRY

Mr. MONTAGUE. Mr. Speaker, I introduced day before yesterday a bill appropriating \$10,000 toward defraying the expenses of the celebration of the bicentennial of Patrick Henry, to be held in the county of Hanover in my district in the State of Virginia. The committee very promptly reported this bill favorably, and I understand it was a unanimous report. I have not the report with me, Mr. Speaker, but it is rather illuminating and interesting, and I hope the membership may find time to read it. I do not desire to take up any further time of the House at this time.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of this bill (H. R. 12870) to aid in defraying the expenses for the celebration of the bicentennial of the

birth of Patrick Henry, to be held in Hanover Courthouse, Va., July 15, 16, and 17, 1936.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Virginia?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That there is hereby authorized to be appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$10,000 to aid in defraying the expenses for the celebration of the bicentennial of the birth of Patrick Henry to be held at Hanover Courthouse, Va., July 15, 16, and 17, 1936, such sum to be expended for such purposes by the Patrick Henry Bi-Centennial, Inc., Ashland, Hanover County, Va., and without regard to any other provision of law.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. MURRAY A. HINTZ

Mr. DEMPSEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 6163), for the relief of Mrs. Murray A. Hintz, with a Senate amendment thereto, and agree to the Senate amendment.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendment, as follows:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "not otherwise appropriated" and insert "allocated by the President for the maintenance and operation of the Civilian Conservation Corps."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Mexico?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, as I understand the amendment, it simply provides for getting the money through another channel.

Mr. DEMPSEY. It is to be taken out of the Conservation Corps fund rather than out of unappropriated funds in the Treasury.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Mexico?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendment was concurred in.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. AYERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Tuesday next, after the disposition of matters on the Speaker's table and following any special orders on the calendar for that day, I may address the House for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

NAVAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1937

Mr. UMSTEAD. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 12527) making appropriations for the Navy Department and the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1937, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement may be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 12527) "making appropriations for the Navy Department and the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1937, and for other purposes", having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 6, 7, 10, 11, 12, 13, 15, 21, 23, and 34.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 2, 3, 4, 5, 8, 9, 14, 18, 19, 20, 22, 24, 25, 26, 27, 29, 31, 32, 33, and 35, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 1: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 1, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert: "\$1,147,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 16: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 16, and

agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert: "\$3,395,300"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 17: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 17, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert the following: "including plant, \$1,500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 23: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 23, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment, amended to read as follows: "Provided further, That no part of this appropriation shall be used for the construction of a factory for the manufacture of airplanes"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 30: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 30, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$7,645,575"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 36: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 36, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert: "\$3,985,509"; and the Senate agree to the same.

WILLIAM B. UMSTEAD,

WILLIAM R. THOM,

GEO. W. JOHNSON,

J. G. SCRUGHAM

(except as to amendment no. 14),

CLARENCE J. MCLEOD,

J. WILLIAM DITTER,

Managers on the part of the House.

JAMES F. BYRNES,

ROYAL S. COPELAND,

DAVID I. WALSH,

FREDERICK HALE,

HENRY W. KEYES,

Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 12527) making appropriations for the Navy Department and the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1937, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended as to each of such amendments in the accompanying conference report, namely:

On amendment no. 1: Appropriates \$1,147,500 for "Miscellaneous expenses", instead of \$1,142,500, as proposed by the House, and \$1,162,500, as proposed by the Senate, the agreed increase being for the collection and classification of information.

On amendments nos. 2 to 5, inclusive, relating to the appropriation "Training, education, and welfare, Navy": Appropriates \$130,000 for the Naval Training Station, Newport, R. I., as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$125,000, as proposed by the House, and appropriates \$3,379 to carry out the provisions of the retirement law touching civilian instructors at the Post Graduate School at Annapolis, Md., as proposed by the Senate.

On amendments nos. 6 and 7, relating to the Naval Reserve: Appropriates \$7,868,469, as proposed by the House, instead of \$8,000,000, as proposed by the Senate, and provides for 19 Reserve officers above the grade of lieutenant to be employed on continuous active duty at full pay, as proposed by the House, instead of 20, as proposed by the Senate.

On amendments nos. 8 to 11, inclusive, relating to the Naval Academy: Appropriates an additional \$15,793 for pay of civilian professors and instructors, as proposed by the Senate, \$15,593 being for carrying out the provisions of the retirement law touching such personnel, and \$200 for pay of physical instructors, and appropriates for other classes of personal services \$585,623, as proposed by the House, instead of \$590,866, as proposed by the Senate.

On amendment no. 12: Restores the limitation proposed by the House upon expenditures from the appropriation "Engineering" for Diesel-engine development.

On amendment no. 13: Appropriates for "Ordnance and ordnance stores" \$21,700,000, as proposed by the House, instead of \$22,500,000, as proposed by the Senate.

On amendment no. 14: Strikes out, as proposed by the Senate, the appropriation of \$5,000,000, proposed by the House, looking to the establishment of a reserve supply of strategic minerals of domestic production. In taking this action it was the sense of the managers on the part of both Houses that the Navy Department should appoint a board of officers to make a study of the need of acquiring stocks of domestically produced strategic minerals and that the report of such board should be presented to the Naval and Appropriation Committees of the House and Senate at the commencement of the next regular session.

On amendment no. 15: Eliminates the proposal of the Senate touching the pay and allowances of the present incumbent as attending physician at the Capitol.

On amendments nos. 16 to 21, inclusive, relating to public works, Bureau of Yards and Docks: Appropriates \$3,395,300, instead of \$2,990,300, as proposed by the House, and \$5,000,000, as

proposed by the Senate, the increase of \$405,000 being occasioned by the addition of the following projects proposed by the Senate: Improvement of interior illumination, Naval Academy, \$270,000; improvement of water front, naval operating base, Norfolk, Va. (total cost, \$300,000), \$135,000; increases total cost of harbor and channel improvement project at Pearl Harbor from \$900,000, as proposed by the House, to \$1,500,000, instead of \$2,000,000, as proposed by the Senate, and makes such sum of \$1,500,000 available for the procurement of dredging equipment, as proposed by the Senate; and strikes out, as proposed by the Senate, the appropriation of \$295,000 of the Naval Hospital fund, proposed by the House, toward new and improved Naval Hospital facilities in the District of Columbia.

On amendments nos. 22 and 23, relating to the appropriation "Aviation, Navy": Increases from \$24,000 to \$50,000, as proposed by the Senate, the amount of the appropriation that may be employed for traveling expenses of service personnel in ferrying new airplanes from point of production to point of operating base, and, with respect to Government production of airplanes and engines, strikes out the inhibition proposed by the House against the Navy engaging in the production of other than primary training airplanes and of airplane engines, other than experimental engines, but retains that portion of the House limitation denying the use of the appropriation for the construction of a factory for the manufacture of airplanes.

On amendments nos. 24 to 30, relating to the Marine Corps: Increases by \$11,250 the maximum amount that may be expended for flying pay of officer personnel, as proposed by the Senate; appropriates an additional \$32,073 for the Marine Corps Reserve on account of 45-day trainees, as proposed by the Senate, and appropriates \$300,000 for transportation, as proposed by the House, instead of \$319,600, as proposed by the Senate.

On amendments nos. 31 to 33, inclusive, relating to the appropriation "Replacement of naval vessels": Provides specifically that the President shall determine as a fact that capital-ship replacement construction has been commenced by any of the other signatory powers to the London Naval Treaty of 1930 before the Navy may begin capital-ship replacement construction, and provides for the merger of unexpended balances on June 30, 1936, of "Increase of the Navy" appropriations with the appropriations proposed under the head of "Replacement of naval vessels", all as proposed by the Senate.

On amendments nos. 34 to 36, inclusive, relating to salaries, Navy Department: Appropriates \$117,720 under the Office of the Judge Advocate General, as proposed by the House, instead of \$120,920, as proposed by the Senate, and appropriates \$61,660 under the Office of Naval Intelligence, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$60,080, as proposed by the House.

WILLIAM B. UMSTEAD,
WILLIAM R. THOM,
GEO. W. JOHNSON,
J. G. SCRUGHAM
(except as to amendment no. 14),
CLARENCE J. MCLEOD,
WILLIAM DITTER,
Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. UMSTEAD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. BIERMANN].

Mr. BIERMANN. Mr. Speaker, in every year since the close of the World War the United States has spent more money on its Navy than any other nation on earth with the exception of one year, when Great Britain spent slightly more than we did. In every year since the close of the World War the United States Government has spent more money on its Army than any other nation on earth. A few weeks ago I put into the RECORD figures that show that for the fiscal year 1937 the United States Government is going to spend for past wars and in preparing for future wars more than \$4,200,000,000. There is no use of this Congress or any political party talking about economy in government or about cutting down expenses or about reducing the burden of the taxpayers if we vote this kind and size of appropriation.

A year ago the Congress passed the so-called Vinson bill, which committed this country to enormous naval armament. Immediately the newspapers carried reports of this action of ours being used in Japan as a reason for voting more money for the navy in Japan. This year, when our naval appropriations bill was being discussed, patriotic people in this Congress—we know they are patriotic because they testify to it themselves—told us that the foreign countries are spending so much money on their navies that we have to spend more money on ours.

After we passed this naval appropriation bill in the House, the following Associated Press dispatch, under a Tokyo date line, appeared in one of the daily newspapers:

TOKYO, JAPAN.—Japan's naval secretary, Admiral Osami Nagano, told parliamentarians Monday Nippon must build more ships soon or be outdistanced by America.

Japan may have a naval strength 80 percent of that of the United States, the admiral said. But, he added, unless a new construction program soon is undertaken, Japan's ratio will fall to 58 percent of American strength by 1941.

Steady progress in United States naval building, said Nagano, is the reason.

Large appropriations here are being used as the excuse for increased appropriations in Japan and then increased appropriations in Japan are used on this floor as the excuse for our increased appropriations, and the record still stands that no one has come onto the floor of the House and attempted to defend these appropriations from the standpoint of defense. We all talk about appropriations for defense, but on the basis of defense they cannot be defended or excused. There is no second lieutenant in the Army and there is no ensign in the Navy who will sign his name to a statement proposing any manner by which this country can be successfully invaded.

These appropriations cannot be excused on any other ground than that the United States is going to engage in war on some foreign shore and I do not imagine there are a dozen Members of the House who want that. [Applause.]

Mr. UMSTEAD. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. LAMBERTSON] such time as he may desire to use.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD regarding the services of my colleague the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CARPENTER], following the remarks of the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD].

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. UMSTEAD. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may desire to use to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DITTER].

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Speaker, I assume the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. BIERMANN] endeavored to impress the House with a startling statement when he said that we were spending more money on our Navy than is being spent by Japan. This is an old story.

Whenever the appropriation bill comes before the House, with regularity and precision, with such regularity that we might even measure the day of the week or the month by it, the gentleman from Iowa makes the startling disclosure about the money spent for the Navy.

Mr. BIERMANN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DITTER. Not now; I will yield later. If the gentleman wants to measure the United States Navy and the personnel of the United States Navy and the pay of the United States Navy and the subsistence which the United States Navy enjoys by a Japanese yardstick, he may do so; but speaking for myself I am not willing to have the boys of the United States Navy provided with a subsistence of fish and rice and kept on a beggarly pittance. [Applause.]

Nor am I willing to lower the standards of the men that work in the navy yards, the men who contribute with their brawn and brain to build up the national defense—I am not willing to measure their standard by the standard prevailing in Japan. [Applause.]

I am proud of the United States Navy. I am proud that the majority of Congress has evinced a spirit that will place them in the fore rank—not in the rear rank of the navies of the world. [Applause.]

Now I will yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. BIERMANN. The gentleman quoted me as saying that we have spent more money on our Navy than Japan. What I said was that this country in every year since the World War had spent more money on its Navy than any other country on earth with the exception of 1 year, when England spent a little more. The gentleman said—

Mr. DITTER. I am not yielding to the gentleman for a speech. If I misquoted the gentleman or if I have not made an accurate statement in relation to what he said, I hope the gentleman will correct me.

Mr. BIERMANN. That is what I am trying to do.

Mr. DITTER. Did the gentleman make the statement that we spent more money on our Navy than Japan did?

Mr. BIERMANN. I did not make it that way. I said we spent more money.

Mr. DITTER. Oh, this is an old matter. The gentleman and I have fought this out before. If the gentleman from Iowa did not leave the impression on other Members, he left the impression on me, that the United States Navy is paying too much of the taxpayers' money for the maintenance of the Navy, and he made a comparison with Japan by which he tried to emphasize the fact that we spent too much on our Navy.

Based on that, if he wants to stand for that kind of a program he may, but, speaking for myself, I want the needs of the boys of the United States Navy and everyone who contributes to the building, maintaining, and operating of our Navy to be based on the standard of living in America rather than the standard of living in Japan. And it is my conviction that the overwhelming majority of the people of the district which I represent have a patriotic fervor which will not be bartered on a Japanese bargain counter. If, as a pacifist, the gentleman from Iowa feels that it is a proper indictment to lay against those of us who are defending a national-defense program, that we spend more than Japan, I am willing to accept the indictment.

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DITTER. I am happy to yield to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. LUCAS. If I understand the gentleman correctly, he is not one of those in this Congress who believes in sinking the Navy and destroying the Army as a matter of national defense.

Mr. DITTER. That is correct. Just a word or two about the bill. Mr. Speaker, I feel that the committee really should be commended for this bill. We have really provided some economy, and I believe every member of the committee has been careful to safeguard the interests of the taxpayers and mindful at the same time about national defense. I must express a regret with respect to one item in the bill. I wish we had provided in the bill—and not having provided for it this year I think in another year we will—for a model basin, which I believe to be necessary. I think it should be provided for our Naval Establishment. I believe that the money that that will entail—an expenditure of approximately \$3,500,000—will be money well spent. It seems to me that at the present time there is inadequate provision for that kind of work which such an experimental station would bring to us. At the present time we are sending to foreign shores some of the vessels that should be tested here at home, and speaking for next year's naval appropriation, I think there is little doubt but that a testing, experimental basin will be provided, and an appropriation brought into the House in connection with it in next year's bill.

Just one other word about another feature of the bill mentioned during this discussion. The Naval Affairs Committee was challenged during the discussion with a matter of the selection board. I think the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Vinson] and the members of his committee, have a definite duty to bring in legislation to correct the conditions that presently prevail in connection with the operation of the selection board. It is my fervent hope that we will have some corrective measures next year, to do away with the criticism presently directed against the operation of that board.

Mr. Speaker, I hope when action is taken on this conference report today there will be a unanimity on the part of those who believe in national defense, to support the report, and that there will be no encouragement given to those individuals who want to measure the United States Navy by the measure of Japan. [Applause.]

Mr. UMSTEAD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO].

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I wonder if it is necessary to appropriate over half a billion dollars to give the sailors and the personnel of the United States an American diet. I wonder if the gentleman from Pennsylvania

[Mr. DITTER], in speaking of the rice diet of Japan, has in mind the diet on which the unemployed of this Nation are now subsisting. This very week 11,000 unemployed of the W. P. A. in New York City have been discharged. Before a month is over the number will be 40,000 discharged from the W. P. A. in New York City. Throughout the country by July 1 over 700,000 unemployed now working on W. P. A. will have been discharged—discharged on the ground of reduction of personnel and for the reason that there are not sufficient funds to carry them on the W. P. A. pay roll. I ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania to please explain to the unemployed in his district just what kind of diet he expects the unemployed in his district to live on, whether it is going to be a Japanese diet or an American diet, after they have been discharged from the W. P. A. by June 30 of this year. Here we are appropriating over half a billion dollars under the guise of so-called national defense. It seems to me that national defense means defense against invasion, defense against a foreign foe who may invade our shores and come into the United States and attack our homes; but does any man with any amount of common sense believe that we need over half a billion dollars to protect our homes from invasion? Are we preparing here for a defensive war, or are we preparing here for an imperialistic war and an offensive war? While we are throwing away over a billion dollars on the Army and the Navy for war purposes, we find we have not sufficient funds to keep 700,000 unemployed on W. P. A. pay rolls. W. P. A., I repeat, is discharging 700,000 unemployed. Let us pause and give some thought to the diet on which they will have to subsist after June 30, 1936.

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Yes.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. UMSTEAD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH].

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, we are now discussing the naval appropriation bill. At the same time we are talking about the welfare of the people in the Navy. No one wants to see the men employed in the Navy kept as well as those in any other department of Government more than I. I am not going to yield to anyone in reference to national defense. I believe we should protect our country, we should have adequate defense. But what is adequate defense? No one has yet defined it, but I do believe that in this naval appropriation bill, where we are spending over \$532,000,000, we are going away beyond what we need to spend at this particular time for adequate defense. When you increase the naval appropriations bill by \$72,000,000, when you are spending \$4,000,000 laying down a couple of keels that the President says may be necessary, when you build two battleships that will cost \$104,000,000 or more; if there ever was a Congress that put this country on the rocks of financial disaster, this Congress is doing it—the greatest spenders in the Nation's history. I do not care whether you are Republicans or Democrats, or what you are, you are spendthrifts and you will regret it. The situation is simply this: You must curb your spending. If you increase your naval appropriation this year you will have to increase it next year. That is the history of the Navy and every other department of the Government. Every time an appropriation bill is increased, the next year it is increased again, because there are more people on the pay rolls.

The only way we are going to get ourselves into a position whereby we can regulate the affairs of this Nation is by economizing in Government department spending.

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. I will yield if you will give me a minute when my 3 minutes have expired.

The statement of Mr. Morgenthau, Secretary of the Treasury, several weeks ago, was that by the end of 1937 we will be \$40,000,000,000 in the red. The fact of the matter is, according to statements that were given out in yesterday's Post, after they pay the bonus and a few other things which this Congress has appropriated, we will be close to \$40,000,000,000 in the red by the end of 1936, a year ahead of

when it was contemplated by the Secretary of the Treasury. Think of it.

Mr. DITTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. If you will give me more time I will.

Mr. UMSTEAD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. If you will give me 5 minutes, I will yield.

Mr. UMSTEAD. Did the gentleman vote for this naval appropriation bill when it was before the House?

Mr. RICH. I did not. No. I am opposed to the great expenditures that we are voting in this House of Representatives. There is not a Member of this House, and the gentleman will be one of them, who will not, within the next 3 or 4 years, wish that we had economized.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. UMSTEAD. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. RICH. I yield now to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DITTER].

Mr. DITTER. Would the gentleman tell us in what way this sum should be reduced? Will he specifically indicate to the House those items which, in his judgment, should be deleted from the bill?

Mr. RICH. Well, the amount you are spending for laying down these new keels. [Applause.]

Mr. DITTER. Will the gentleman tell us how much that is?

Mr. RICH. I do not care if it is only \$50, the principle of it is wrong. The trouble with those who are for a large Navy is they cannot help but spend more to build up a greater naval organization, so they have more power in affairs of Government. I do not believe we need to spend \$100,000,000 for battleships for national defense. One-fourth of the amount for airplanes will, in my judgment, do four times the good in national defense.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania has again expired.

Mr. UMSTEAD. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GIFFORD].

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I would like to supplement the remarks of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] in the matter of expenditures, but I pretend to know but very little about the merits of this bill. As I have said before, we have to go along with our committee.

Before we returned this year we were often invited to meetings on the subject of neutrality and military expenditure, and we must make a report of our legislative action. We found in framing neutrality laws that it was like climbing a tree to put out a forest fire, and we passed legislation that seemed far from being effective. We have to yield now to the judgment of the committee. They say we need a Navy sufficient for national defense. We do not know exactly what is necessary or the type of defense that may be most needed. I live near Boston, and I cannot sympathize with the danger the gentleman does not fear in case of attack. But is there not something more than the national defense in this bill? Do you big Navy men really mean that you want a Navy large enough to assert our rights on the high seas? Do you want a Navy large enough to protect and preserve our honor? No one seems to dare make that assertion. You simply say, "We want a Navy for national defense." Why cannot someone here be courageous enough to say, if this expenditure means it, "We want a Navy large enough to protect our honor"? I just want to call attention to the fact that no one seems to have discussed this phase of the argument.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIFFORD. Gladly.

Mr. RICH. If we would protect our honor, we would stay at home and attend to our own business and we would not be afraid of foreign nations. [Applause.]

Mr. GIFFORD. That is a very important question, and I wonder what attitude this Congress would take, representing our people, if a question of our honor really was at stake. The impression I now have is that only enough money should be asked for that will insure our safety within our own boundaries.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. UMSTEAD. Mr. Speaker, it is not a precedent but it is an unusual experience to present a conference report which, if adopted will result in the total of the naval appropriation bill carrying \$4,522,175 less than the bill carried when it was sent from the House to the Senate. As passed by the House the bill carried a total of \$531,068,707. If the conference report is adopted, the total will be \$526,546,532. The amount carried in the bill is \$23,044,767 below the total proposed in the Budget.

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RELIEF OF CERTAIN OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE FOREIGN SERVICE

Mr. McREYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (S. 267) for the relief of certain officers and employees of the Foreign Service of the United States who, while in the course of their respective duties, suffered losses of personal property by reason of catastrophes of nature, and ask that the statement be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to the bill (S. 267) for the relief of certain officers and employees of the Foreign Service of the United States who, while in the course of their respective duties, suffered losses of personal property by reason of catastrophes of nature, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the House numbered 1 and 4, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 2: That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House numbered 2, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert: "\$19,745.33"; and the House agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 3: That the Senate recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the House numbered 3, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert: "\$19,592.25"; and the House agree to the same.

S. D. McREYNOLDS,

SOL BLOOM,

HAMILTON FISH, JR.

Managers on the part of the House.

KEY PITTMAN,

ROBERT J. BULKLEY,

WALLACE H. WHITE, JR.,

Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the House to S. 267, authorizing an appropriation for the relief of certain officers and employees of the Foreign Service of the United States, who, while in the course of their respective duties, suffered losses of personal property by reason of catastrophes of nature, submit the following written statement explaining the effect of the action agreed upon:

The Senate receded from its disagreement to the amendments of the House nos. 1 and 4. The no. 1 amendment added in the House was "Gustava Hanna, widow of." Matthew E. Hanna, the husband, died during the consideration of the pending bill and it was necessary to insert the name of his widow. Amendment 4, made by the House, struck out "\$1,006.82" and inserted "\$821.92." This was the loss represented by Willard L. Beaulac, secretary of the American legation at Managua, Nicaragua, when the earthquake occurred. This was agreed to by the Senate. Amendments 2 and 3 in conference were in reference to the amount of the loss sustained by Matthew E. Hanna, American Minister to Nicaragua, during the earthquake which occurred on March 31, 1931. The bill as passed in the Senate gave the amount of this loss as "\$25,368.58", which was amended in the House by inserting "\$16,122.08", and the amount agreed upon in conference was "\$19,745.33", which is amendment no. 2. The Senate bill

called for "\$25,215.50", which was amended in the House by inserting "\$15,969", and the amount agreed to in conference was "\$19,592.25", which is amendment no. 3.

S. D. McREYNOLDS,
SOL BLOOM,
HAMILTON FISH, Jr.,
Managers on the Part of the House.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Tennessee explain the conference report?

Mr. McREYNOLDS. I shall be pleased to do so. This is a bill providing for payment for certain property destroyed by a volcano in a foreign country, personal property of Mr. Hanna, who was the representative in that country of this Government at that time. As the bill passed the Senate it carried \$25,368.58. The original claim was \$36,971.50. A subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House to which the bill was referred recommended \$15,969, but the full committee overrode the action of the subcommittee and reported \$25,368.58. The bill was objected to in the House and went back to the committee, being finally reported out carrying the minimum amount of \$15,969. It was passed by the House and went to the Senate in that form.

The conference report represents a compromise between the two Houses with the amount agreed upon about halfway between the figures of the two Houses. The main question of difference came on the matter of what items were necessary for these people to have at that location at that time for the service of this Government.

Mr. TABER. What position did Mr. Hanna occupy?

Mr. McREYNOLDS. He was our minister.

Mr. TABER. And he claimed to have lost \$35,000 of personal effects?

Mr. McREYNOLDS. Yes. We held that that was more than necessary in his status at that time.

Mr. TABER. And the House finally allowed \$15,969?

Mr. McREYNOLDS. Yes; that was the action of the House; and the compromise between the two Houses fixed the amount at \$19,745.33.

Mr. TABER. Is not that an excessive amount for personal and household effects?

Mr. McREYNOLDS. We thought so in the House at the time, but there was such a difference of opinion as to what was necessary that no one could reach a definite conclusion in the matter.

Mr. TABER. Does the gentleman really think Mr. Hanna had that amount of personal and household effects?

Mr. McREYNOLDS. He did; he had that and more.

Mr. THURSTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McREYNOLDS. I yield.

Mr. THURSTON. Is it our policy for the Federal Government in effect to carry insurance on the personal effects of members of the Foreign Service?

Mr. McREYNOLDS. No. In this case the building was furnished by the minister himself because we had no furnishings there. It has been the policy to take care of losses in such cases.

Mr. THURSTON. I assume the other employees would have to carry their own insurance on their personal effects.

Mr. McREYNOLDS. I do not know. They did where this office was located.

Mr. THURSTON. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. McREYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the conference report.

The previous question was ordered.

The conference report was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CORRECTION

Mr. FOCHT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to correct the RECORD.

In the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 26, 1936, page 7954, is a statement to the effect that on June 12, 1930, the first speech ever made in the American Congress on old-age pensions was delivered by Congressman T. ALAN GOLDSBOROUGH. This was, of course, a statement inadvertently made, since it is not in accordance with the facts.

On December 6, 1915, a bill, H. R. 233, was introduced by me for the pensioning of American citizens who had reached

the age of 65 years, were incapable of manual labor, and whose incomes were less than \$200 per annum.

On September 8, 1916, page 2253 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, will be found a speech of some length I delivered in this House in support of my old-age pension bill. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the RECORD will be corrected accordingly.

There was no objection.

Mr. FOCHT. Let me add, that soon after introducing my old-age-pension measure and speaking on it and urging the justice and humanity and righteousness of properly caring for the aged, America entered the World War, when everything else was laid aside to win that war. After retiring from Congress in 1923 and having been the first to, in a legislative way, call the attention of the country to old-age pensions, my activities for the help of the aged were continued in Pennsylvania, where legislative action was being inaugurated by the State legislature.

In July 1933, Governor Pinchot proposed an extraordinary session of the Pennsylvania Legislature for the purpose of enacting old-age-pension legislation. Some of the Republican leaders did not realize the importance of accepting the Governor's challenge, and the next year lost the State to the Democrats for United States Senator, 22 Congressmen, the Governor, and State offices. On this date I sent the following telegram to Republican State Chairman Gen. Edward Martin, and which appeared in the daily press of the State:

Assuming the challenge of Governor Pinchot as it appeared in the evening papers to be correct, I would urge upon you the acceptance of this challenge to call the legislature in extra session and pass the old-age-pension bill, conditioned that the senators and members serve without salary the same as Members of Congress do who are called to attend extra sessions. This will clarify the attitude of the Republican State organization toward the old-age-pension law and other humanitarian enactments. As you know, the bill can be readily put through under suspension of the rules in less than a week.

It will be recalled that Congressman Focht first introduced an old-age-pension bill in Congress in 1915 and now has a bill on the calendar there for the same purpose to be considered at the next session to convene in January. Mr. Focht has been identified with the Republican organization for 50 years and is a hearty supporter of progressive organization politics.

Again, on December 30, 1935, my attitude on old-age pensions was solicited by the press, and the following is my answer:

"I am in favor of old-age pensions—safe and sane old-age pensions—just as I was in 1915, when I introduced in Congress the first bill to provide pensions for the aged", Congressman BENJAMIN K. FOCHT, of Lewisburg, representing the Eighteenth District, declared today following the use of his name as one of 39 Members of the House who are claimed as supporters of the Townsend \$200-a-month old-age-pension plan at the coming session.

"I have not committed myself to the Townsend plan, nor will I", Congressman FOCHT said. "I was queried upon the measure and stated my position as I am stating it now. I asked that my letter be used in setting forth my position, but this apparently has not been done." The Townsend National Weekly, official organ of Old Age Revolving Pensions, Ltd., cited the names of 39 Congressmen who were claimed to be in favor of the Townsend plan, and the name of Congressman FOCHT was included.

"My record on old-age pensions speaks for itself", Congressman FOCHT said, "and it has not changed. However, to say that I am in favor of the Townsend plan, when it has not yet been formulated, is just shooting too many stars. I am afraid that Dr. Townsend is overleaping the horse, and to definitely commit myself before the Townsend plan is presented in definite form would be rank folly."

In speaking of a safe and sane pension plan Congressman FOCHT suggested a proposition whereby the Federal Government, the State, and county would each contribute a reasonable sum.

SUFFRAGE FOR RESIDENTS OF DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The SPEAKER. The Chair has been handed a petition signed by prominent citizens of the District of Columbia, representing the Citizens' Joint Committee on National Representation and cooperating organizations proposing a constitutional amendment empowering Congress to grant to residents of the District of Columbia representation in the House, Senate, and electoral college with the same rights as are enjoyed by residents of the States, with the request that it be brought to the attention of the House. The Chair does so, and refers the petition to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATION BILL, 1937—CONFERENCE REPORT

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 11418) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and for the Farm Credit Administration for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1937, and for other purposes, and ask unanimous consent that the statement be read in lieu of the report.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. McREYNOLDS). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the statement.

The conference report and statement are as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 11418) "making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and for the Farm Credit Administration for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1937, and for other purposes," having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 8, 9, 10, 11, 15, 18, 21, 26, 42, 52½, 54, 57, 60, 63, 74, 77, 83, 89, 90, 93 and 94.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 22, 29, 47, 53, 55, 58, 61, 75, 76, 78 and 79, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 12: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 12, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert: "\$22,107,870"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 13: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 13, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert: "\$1,494,089"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 14: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 14, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert: "\$3,861,024"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 17: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 17, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert: "\$769,503"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 19: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 19, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert: "\$669,935"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 20: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 20, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert: "\$5,258,194"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 23: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 23, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert: "\$10,063,963"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 24: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 24, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert: "\$629,099"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 25: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 25, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert: "\$697,094"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 27: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 27, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert: "\$1,140,454"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 28: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 28, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert: "\$4,551,206"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 30: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 30, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert: "\$565,232"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 31: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 31, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert: "\$1,803,445"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 32: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 32, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert: "\$950,984"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 33: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 33, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert: "\$964,487"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 34: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 34, and

agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert: "\$1,180,069"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 35: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 35, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert: "\$1,663,590"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 36: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 36, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert: "\$1,665,988"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 37: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 37, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert: "\$559,307"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 38: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 38, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert: "\$1,019,304"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 39: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 39, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert: "\$897,817"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 40: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 40, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert: "\$110,959"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 41: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 41, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert: "\$10,815,950"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 43: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 43, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert: "\$608,361"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 44: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 44, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert: "\$200,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 45: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 45, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert: "\$91,295"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 46: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 46, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert the following: "\$269,152: *Provided*, That \$170,000 of this appropriation shall be available only for maintenance in nurseries of existing stocks and for the free distribution thereof to farmers, in liquidation of the so-called shelterbelt project of trees or shrubs in the plains region undertaken heretofore pursuant to appropriations made for emergency purposes"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 48: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 48, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert: "\$13,462,919"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 49: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 49, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert: "\$1,655,007"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 50: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 50, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert the following:

"For the acquisition of forest lands under the provisions of the Act approved March 1, 1911 (36 Stat., p. 961), as amended (U. S. C., title 16, secs. 500, 513, 515, 516, 517, 518, 519, 521, 552, 563), \$2,500,000: *Provided*, That not to exceed \$50,000 of the sum appropriated in this paragraph may be expended for departmental personal services in the District of Columbia."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 51: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 51, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert: "\$17,738,505"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 52: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 52, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert: "\$50,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 56: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 56, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert: "\$1,398,272"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 59: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 59, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert: "\$173,625"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 62: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 62, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert: "\$5,317,675"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 64: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 64, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert: "\$95,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 65: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 65, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert: "\$138,149"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 66: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 66, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert: "\$300,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 67: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 67, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert: "\$130,798"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 68: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 68, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert: "\$335,772"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 69: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 69, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert: "\$79,753"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 70: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 70, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert: "\$1,961,224"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 72: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 72, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert: "\$400,669"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 73: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 73, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert: "\$438,269"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 80: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 80, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert: "\$321,665"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 81: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 81, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert: "\$5,966,244"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 82: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 82, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert: "\$5,992,896"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 84: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 84, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert: "\$1,600,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 87: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 87, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert: "\$601,512"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 88: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 88, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert: "\$20,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 91: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 91, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert: "\$22,853,485"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 92: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 92, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert: "\$24,869,265"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 95: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 95, and

agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert: "\$21,364,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 96: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 96, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert: "\$8,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 97: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 97, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed, insert: "\$4,500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference report in disagreement amendments numbered 2, 16, 71, 85, and 86.

CLARENCE CANNON,
M. C. TARVER,
WILLIAM B. UMSTEAD,
W. R. THOM,
J. P. BUCHANAN,
LLOYD THURSTON,
JOHN TABER,

Managers on the part of the House.

RICHARD B. RUSSELL, Jr.,
CARL HAYDEN,
E. D. SMITH,
HENRY W. KEYES,
CHAS. L. McNARY,

Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT

The managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 11418) making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture and the Farm Credit Administration for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1937, and for other purposes, submit the following statement in explanation of the effect of the action agreed upon and recommended in the accompanying conference report, as to each of such amendments, namely:

ADJUSTMENT OF TOTALS, ALLOCATIONS, CLARIFICATION OF TEXT, ETC.

The following amendments relate to the adjustment of totals, allocations, clarification of text, etc.: Amendments nos. 4, 6, 10, 11, 12, 14, 23, 25, 28, 29, 48, 51, 52, 53, 56, 61, 62, 63, 70, 73, 81, 87, 88, 92, 93, 94, and 97.

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

On amendment no. 1: Salaries, office of the Secretary: Appropriates \$432,271 as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$411,311 as proposed by the House.

On amendment no. 3: Miscellaneous expenses: Appropriates \$120,748, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$119,248, as proposed by the House.

OFFICE OF THE SOLICITOR

On amendment no. 5: Salaries and expenses, Office of the Solicitor: Appropriates \$188,801, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$159,729, as proposed by the House.

LIBRARY

On amendment no. 7: Salaries and expenses: Appropriates \$103,800, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$101,806, as proposed by the House.

EXTENSION SERVICE

On amendment no. 8: Supplementary Smith-Lever fund. Extension Service: Appropriates \$1,185,000, as proposed by the House, instead of \$1,580,000, as proposed by the Senate.

On amendment no. 9: Additional cooperative agricultural extension work: Appropriates \$750,000, as proposed by the House, instead of \$1,000,000, as proposed by the Senate, and retains the House provision, stricken out by the Senate, directing the Secretary to so allot the appropriation to the several States that, taken into consideration with the allotments of other Federal funds appropriated for payments to States for cooperative extension work, the total allotment to each State from all funds so appropriated shall not be less than for the fiscal year 1936.

WEATHER BUREAU

On amendment no. 13: Aerology, Weather Bureau: Appropriates \$1,494,089 instead of \$1,443,789, as proposed by the House, and \$1,544,389, as proposed by the Senate.

On amendment no. 15: Detail of Weather Bureau employees for training at civilian institutions: Strikes out the provision, inserted by the Senate, authorizing the Secretary to detail annually not to exceed 10 employees of the Weather Bureau for training, at civilian institutions, in advanced methods of meteorological science.

On amendment no. 17: Animal husbandry investigations: (a) Strikes out the Senate increase of \$31,500 for additional expenses in connection with the new animal-husbandry laboratory at Beltsville.

(b) Retains the Senate increase of \$3,500 for maintenance of new facilities at the poultry experiment station, Glendale, Ariz.

(c) Appropriates \$7,500, instead of \$15,000, as provided by the Senate, for mule-breeding investigations.

On amendment no. 18: Eradicating cattle ticks: Appropriates \$513,940, as proposed by the House, instead of \$613,940, as proposed by the Senate.

On amendment no. 19: Inspection and quarantine, Bureau of Animal Industry: Appropriates \$669,935, instead of \$658,695, as proposed by the House, and \$681,174, as proposed by the Senate.

On amendment no. 20: Meat inspection: Appropriates \$5,258,194, instead of \$5,161,253, as proposed by the House, and \$5,355,135, as proposed by the Senate.

On amendment no. 21: Packers and Stockyards Act: Appropriates \$381,879, as proposed by the House, instead of \$428,779, as proposed by the Senate.

On amendment no. 22: Eradication of foot-and-mouth and other contagious diseases of animals: Reappropriates the entire unexpended balance (estimated at approximately \$1,315,000) of the appropriation for eradication of foot-and-mouth and other contagious diseases of animals, as proposed by the Senate, instead of not to exceed \$500,000 of such unexpended balance, as proposed by the House.

BUREAU OF DAIRY INDUSTRY

On amendment no. 24: Dairy investigations: Appropriates \$629,099 instead of \$607,099, as proposed by the House, and \$636,099, as proposed by the Senate.

BUREAU OF PLANT INDUSTRY

On amendment no. 26: Spring-wheat investigations: Retains the House increase of \$15,000, stricken out by the Senate, made in the appropriation for cereal crops and diseases for spring-wheat investigations.

On amendment no. 27: Fruit and vegetable crops and diseases: (a) Appropriates \$6,000, as proposed by the Senate, for pecan investigations.

(b) Appropriates \$16,000 for deciduous fruit-breeding investigations and tomato-plant diseases instead of \$25,000 for deciduous fruit-breeding investigations and \$30,000 for tomato-plant diseases, as proposed by the Senate.

FOREST SERVICE

On amendment no. 30: General administrative expenses: Appropriates \$565,232 instead of \$532,163, as proposed by the House, and \$598,300, as proposed by the Senate.

On amendments nos. 31-41: National forest administration: Appropriates \$10,815,950 instead of \$9,925,561, as proposed by the House, and \$11,706,335, as proposed by the Senate.

On amendment no. 42: Range investigations:

(a) Provides an increase of \$20,000 for grazing-management investigations in California and the Pacific Northwest, as proposed by the House, instead of \$40,000, as proposed by the Senate.

(b) Provides an increase of \$7,500 for reseeding investigations, intermountain region, as proposed by the House, instead of \$15,000, as proposed by the Senate.

On amendment no. 43: Forest products: Appropriates \$608,361 instead of \$499,022, as proposed by the House, and \$1,000,000, as proposed by the Senate.

On amendment no. 44: Forest survey: Appropriates \$200,000 instead of \$150,000, as proposed by the House, and \$250,000, as proposed by the Senate.

On amendment no. 45: Forest economics: Appropriates \$91,295, instead of \$81,295, as proposed by the House, and \$129,295, as proposed by the Senate.

On amendment no. 46: Plains shelterbelt: Strikes out the Senate increase of \$1,000,000 in the appropriation for forest influences, to be used in further work on the plains shelterbelt project, and inserts in lieu thereof a provision which contemplates the discontinuance of the project and provides an increase in the appropriation in the sum of \$170,000 for liquidation of same by free distribution to farmers of young trees still in the nurseries.

On amendment no. 47: Prohibition against the use of any money appropriated in the bill for the plains shelterbelt project: Strikes out the House provision, as proposed by the Senate, prohibiting the use of any money appropriated in the bill for the plains shelterbelt project.

On amendment no. 49: Forest-fire cooperation: Appropriates \$1,655,007, instead of \$1,578,632, as proposed by the House, and \$1,731,382, as proposed by the Senate.

On amendment no. 50: Acquisition of forest lands: Appropriates \$2,500,000, instead of \$10,000,000, as proposed by the Senate, for acquisition of forest lands; strikes out the Senate provision that \$5,000,000 shall be immediately available, and makes \$50,000 of the appropriation, instead of \$100,000, as provided by the Senate, available for personal services in the District of Columbia.

BUREAU OF CHEMISTRY AND SOILS

On amendment no. 52½: Agricultural fires: Strikes out the Senate increase of \$10,000 for additional studies of the causes of farm fires.

On amendment no. 54: Soil survey: Appropriates \$301,208, as proposed by the House, instead of \$381,208, as proposed by the Senate.

On amendment no. 55: Soil chemical and physical investigations: Appropriates \$78,081, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$68,081, as proposed by the House.

BUREAU OF ENTOMOLOGY AND PLANT QUARANTINE

On amendment no. 57: General administrative expenses: Appropriates \$162,288, as proposed by the House, instead of \$164,288, as proposed by the Senate.

On amendment no. 58: Japanese beetle control: Appropriates \$350,000, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$400,000, as proposed by the House.

On amendment no. 59: Forest insects: Appropriates \$173,625 instead of \$159,415, as proposed by the House, and \$187,835, as proposed by the Senate.

On amendment no. 60: Dutch elm disease eradication: Appropriates \$261,156, as proposed by the House, instead of \$3,000,000, as

proposed by the Senate. This action is predicated upon assurances contained in a letter from Mr. Harry L. Hopkins, Administrator, Works Progress Administration, that the Dutch elm disease work is an eligible project for that Administration and suitable for inclusion in a works program, and the belief of the conferees that this work will be cared for next year out of emergency funds as is being done the current year.

BUREAU OF BIOLOGICAL SURVEY

On amendment no. 64: General administrative expenses: Appropriates \$95,000 instead of \$79,595, as proposed by the House, and \$125,000, as proposed by the Senate.

On amendment no. 65: Game-management surveys: Appropriates \$138,149 for game-management surveys under the appropriation "Biological investigations", instead of \$128,149, as proposed by the House, and \$158,149, as proposed by the Senate.

On amendment no. 66: Protection of migratory birds: Appropriates \$300,000 instead of \$279,978, as proposed by the House, and \$322,978, as proposed by the Senate.

On amendment no. 67: Enforcement of Alaska game law: Appropriates \$130,798 instead of \$96,596, as proposed by the House, and \$165,000, as proposed by the Senate.

On amendment no. 68: Maintenance of mammal and bird reservations: Appropriates \$335,772 instead of \$300,672, as proposed by the House, and \$370,872, as proposed by the Senate.

On amendment no. 69: Migratory-bird conservation refuges: Appropriates \$79,753 instead of \$74,853, as proposed by the House, and \$84,653, as proposed by the Senate.

BUREAU OF AGRICULTURAL ENGINEERING

On amendment no. 72: Agricultural engineering investigations: (a) Strikes out the Senate increase of \$10,000 for farm mechanical equipment pertaining to the cultivation of cotton.

(b) Provides an increase of \$15,000 for cotton-ginning machinery, instead of \$19,000 as proposed by the Senate.

BUREAU OF AGRICULTURAL ECONOMICS

Amendment no. 74: Farm-population and rural-life studies: Provides an increase of \$7,500 for farm-population and rural-life studies, as proposed by the House, instead of \$17,500, as proposed by the Senate.

On amendment no. 75: Analysis and statistical research on agricultural conditions and trends, marketing and distributing farm products:

(a) Retains the Senate increase of \$6,250 for gathering and analyzing tobacco statistics.

(b) Retains the Senate increase of \$6,250 for statistical analyses on fats and oils.

On amendment no. 76: Crop and livestock estimates—poultry and eggs: Retains the Senate increase of \$25,000 for crop and livestock estimates on poultry and eggs.

On amendment no. 77: Market inspection of farm products—cottonseed: Strikes out the word "cottonseed" inserted by the Senate in the list of farm products in the appropriation "Market inspection of farm products."

On amendment no. 78: Market news service—cottonseed: Retains the word "cottonseed" inserted by the Senate in the list of farm products in the appropriation "Market news service."

On amendment no. 79: United States Grain Standards Act: Appropriates \$723,941, as proposed by the Senate, instead of \$708,941, as proposed by the House.

On amendment no. 80: United States Warehouse Act: Appropriates \$321,665, instead of \$316,665, as proposed by the House, and \$326,665, as proposed by the Senate.

ENFORCEMENT OF GRAIN FUTURES ACT

On amendment no. 83: Enforcement of Grain Futures Act: Appropriates \$196,500, as proposed by the House, instead of \$201,640, as proposed by the Senate.

FOOD AND DRUG ADMINISTRATION

On amendment no. 84: Enforcement of Food and Drugs Act: Appropriates \$1,600,000, instead of \$1,537,459, as proposed by the House, and \$2,062,079, as proposed by the Senate.

SOIL CONSERVATION SERVICE

On amendment no. 89: General administrative expenses: Appropriates \$475,000, as proposed by the House, instead of \$551,250, as proposed by the Senate.

On amendment no. 90: Soil and moisture conservation and land-use investigations: Appropriates \$1,540,780, as proposed by the House, instead of \$2,393,776, as proposed by the Senate, as follows:

1. For investigations under controlled plot and laboratory conditions, \$645,140;

2. For investigations on entire experiment drainage units, \$500,318;

3. For sedimentation investigations, \$106,037;

4. For geographic and climatic investigations, \$89,285;

5. For economics of erosion investigations, \$100,000; and

6. For erosion-resisting plant investigations, \$100,000.

Amendment no. 91: Soil and moisture conservation operations, demonstrations, and information: Appropriates \$22,853,485, instead of \$20,453,485, as proposed by the House, and \$29,554,974, as proposed by the Senate, as follows:

1. For conservation surveys, \$660,624;

2. For demonstration projects, \$14,674,410, being \$1,200,000 in excess of the amount proposed by the House;

3. For work on watersheds largely owned by the Government, \$3,836,357, being \$1,200,000 in excess of the amount proposed by the House;

4. For cooperation with conservancy districts, \$581,084;
5. For operation of erosion nurseries, \$1,383,738; and
6. For cooperation with other Federal agencies, and with State and local agencies, \$1,717,272.

ELIMINATION OF DISEASED CATTLE

On amendment no. 95: Elimination of diseased cattle: Provides a reappropriation of \$21,364,000, instead of \$17,500,000, as proposed by the House, and \$25,228,000, as proposed by the Senate, the entire amount of the increase above the House figure being for Bang's disease work, in addition to the sum of \$11,350,000 allocated for that purpose under the amount originally appropriated by the House.

FOREST ROADS AND TRAILS

On amendment no. 96: Forest roads and trails: Appropriates \$8,000,000 instead of \$7,082,600, as proposed by the House, and \$10,000,000, as proposed by the Senate.

AMENDMENTS IN DISAGREEMENT

The committee of conference report in disagreement the following amendments of the Senate:

On amendment no. 2: Purchase of arms and ammunition: Authorizing the purchase of arms and ammunition in the open market when same cannot advantageously be supplied by the Secretary of War pursuant to the act of March 3, 1879 (20 Stat. 412).

BUREAU OF ANIMAL INDUSTRY

On amendment no. 16: Payment by dealers of travel and subsistence expenses incident to livestock inspections at places other than the official headquarters of the inspector: Authorizing the payment by the owners of or dealers in livestock and other animal products, of travel and subsistence expenses incident to inspection of such products at points other than the official headquarters of the inspectors.

On amendment no. 71: Public lands, highways: Cancels the authorization for an appropriation of \$2,500,000 for the fiscal year 1937 and makes the same applicable to the fiscal year 1938.

On amendment no. 85: Sea-food inspectors: Appropriating \$80,000 for sea-food inspectors.

On amendment no. 86: Adjusting the total for Food and Drug Administration, which is dependent upon final action to be taken as to amendment no. 85.

CLARENCE CANNON,
M. C. TARVER,
WILLIAM B. UMSTEAD,
W. R. THOM,
J. P. BUCHANAN,
LLOYD THURSTON,
JOHN TABER,

Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I regret to report that this bill is \$1,000,000, in round numbers, in excess of the Budget recommendation. As the bill was reported by the committee and as it passed the House it was \$11,000,000 under the Budget estimate. The Senate exceeded the Budget by \$29,000,000, in round numbers; and we finally compromised on a bill, as presented in this conference report, in round numbers, \$1,000,000 in excess of the Budget.

As large as the bill is, it is not large enough to provide for many additional appropriations asked by those who appeared before the committee urging provision for additional projects or larger appropriations for those already provided for; and I want to express appreciation of the kindness of those whose requests we were unable to approve, and especially our colleagues for their consideration and tolerance when we were unable to take care of all of them.

Every dollar perhaps requested by our colleagues was justified. I am certain the money, if appropriated, would have been well spent, but we had to cut the cost to the cloth, and even after making every effort to keep the bill within bounds it is one of the largest agricultural appropriation bills ever reported to the Congress.

Mr. LUDLOW. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. LUDLOW. Can the gentleman from Missouri, one of the ablest men who ever served in this Congress, tell us what the conference did with reference to that strange and fantastic project known as the shelterbelt?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. No provision was made by the House for the shelterbelt project. The Senate added \$1,000,000 for that purpose. The committee on conference finally agreed to compromise on \$170,000, with the provision that it should be used to liquidate the entire project.

Mr. LUDLOW. The gentleman believes, does he not, if this legislation prevails, the project will be absolutely liquidated

and wound up, and there will be no reason for future appropriations by the Congress for this purpose?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. This bill disposes finally and completely of the entire shelterbelt project.

Mr. LUDLOW. I appreciate all the gentleman has done to wind up this strange and fantastic venture, but may I ask him just why it is necessary to appropriate \$170,000 for this purpose? Is there some moral or legal commitment there that requires this expenditure?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. There is no commitment, but we have in the nurseries at the present time a little in excess of 60,000,000 trees. If no provision is made to dispose of them, the money which has been previously spent in their production will be wasted, and it was thought this amount would be justified in order to distribute to the farmers the remaining trees now in process of production.

Mr. THURSTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. THURSTON. Amplifying what the gentleman has just said, if the executive branch of the Government will not make funds available to projects which have had the express disapproval of the Congress, then the project will be terminated?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. This will effectively and finally conclude the entire project.

Mr. LUDLOW. As one Member of the Congress, I wish to extend my congratulations and my commendation to the able gentleman and his conferees for being instrumental in bringing about the abandonment of this very wasteful and impossible project. It was proposed to spend \$258,000,000 in the creation of a forest belt across the United States, including regions where the Lord will hardly permit a cactus to grow. It is not given to men to so reverse the order of Creation. The whole project reeked with wastefulness. Even a pamphlet that was issued to advertise it was prepared in such an expensive way and with such artistic embellishment that it cost the taxpayers of this country \$4,011.64.

I wonder how long it will take us to learn that the road to economy is the road to recovery, and that we will never again have happiness and prosperity in America unless we stop such wastefulness.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I may say there were many reasons which justify this project. Undoubtedly the completed shelterbelt would be of great service, especially in that particular section of the country. The liquidation of the project does not necessarily indicate lack of merit, but the committee thought that under present circumstances it was not advisable to spend this amount for the purpose.

Mr. BIERMANN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. BIERMANN. Did I correctly understand the gentleman to say that about 6,000,000 trees are now in the nurseries to be set out?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Something in excess of 60,000,000 trees.

Mr. BIERMANN. Can the gentleman tell us in what States these trees are to be set out?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I do not suppose there will be any necessity for prorating them. They will be distributed to all farmers who desire them and who will agree to plant them without expense to the Government. If there should be so many applications that the supply would not be adequate, doubtless they would apportion them to the various States in which the shelterbelt project is located.

Mr. BIERMANN. Does not the location of the trees depend in some measure on the kind of trees they are?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. All of these trees are varieties which are adapted to the region in which they are to be planted.

Mr. BIERMANN. Does the gentleman have any information as to how the trees are getting along that were planted previously?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. We have received reports and photographs indicating a survival in some cases of almost

100 percent. In other cases, especially in regions visited by the drought, the mortality was high, but there is reason to believe that with the data now available trees can be supplied that will survive in practically all parts of this area.

Mr. BIERMANN. This money will not be entirely wasted. There will be much good result in the way of trees?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I do not think a dollar of this appropriation will be wasted. We should get several dollars' benefit out of every dollar expended.

Mr. BIERMANN. Does the gentleman have any figures as to how much money has been spent on this shelterbelt up to date?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. We expended last year \$2,700,000.

Mr. BIERMANN. That plus the \$170,000 included in the present bill is the total?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. That will be the total cost at the close of the next fiscal year.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Did the conferees consider any provision allowing the remaining trees to be sent to farmers to be planted in wood lots or something like that?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. No stipulation is made as to exactly where these trees shall be located. That is left with the individual farmer, but our understanding is that a large part of them will be planted in wood lots and around the homestead, where they will be cared for and produce the greatest benefits.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. I may say that I have felt from the first this project was doomed to failure; and, although I am not rejoicing, I was convinced from the first, as I say, that the project would fail, because I have seen too much of these trees trying to grow under existing circumstances.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I may say in response to the gentleman that the results obtained from this project are not to be measured by the number of trees which have been planted and which now survive but rather of the impetus given to reforestation throughout the West. In the future, as these trees develop, the farmers, seeing the results, will plant trees at their own expense. The project is to that extent demonstrational and educational.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I am glad to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. LAMBERTSON. On the other hand, I think the shelterbelt has brought ridicule on the idea of planting trees. If they had designed them from the first for wood lots, then much good would have come from it, but I cannot think this has done a great deal of good because it has been so fantastic.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. May I say to the gentleman that not all of them were planted in shelterbelt blocks but on practically every farmstead in this area the trees were used about the buildings and have added materially to the comfort and beauty of these farm homes.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, will my colleague yield to me in this connection?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to my colleague on the committee, the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. TARVER. In view of the statements made by the chairman and the possibility that there may be an effort made to secure an allocation to work of this character of further public-works funds, I feel it is proper that the RECORD should show that a majority of the conferees on the part of the House thought this project had not been successful and that it would be unwise to continue it, and that it was not simply a question of lack of funds which influenced your conferees to insist that the project should be liquidated.

I may say also in this connection that as one member of the conference I felt that the funds which have been allocated to this work and are now unused, which appeared to be at the time of the hearings before our subcommittee \$750,000 in amount, should be properly used for the liquidation of the project and that no appropriation ought to be

made by Congress for the purpose of liquidation at all, and I still hope that when the administrative authorities having this matter in charge find that Congress has disapproved the continuation of the project, instead of using the funds that are carried in this bill to liquidate it, they will use the funds which have been allocated them insofar as they are unexpended for the purpose of carrying out the liquidation proposed by Congress, and that it will not be necessary to spend the amount of \$170,000 carried in the bill.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I may say, Mr. Speaker, of course, there is room for wide divergence of opinion on this as on other items in the bill. There appeared before the committee witnesses and experts who testified to the great usefulness of this project and to the valuable results that would be derived from it, both at the present time and for many years to come, and the committee, after considering the matter exhaustively, thought it wise to provide sufficient funds to take care of the remaining trees and then liquidate the project.

Mr. THURSTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. THURSTON. In justification for allowing \$170,000, it was the thought of the subcommittee that this fund might be expended in assisting in the distribution of these trees among the farmers so that they could have them to erect windbreaks around their premises. So the winding up or the discontinuance of the belt idea still has the sympathetic consideration of the subcommittee in promoting stock to build windbreaks around the homes of farmers who want to obtain and plant these trees.

Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee. May I inquire of the gentleman about the appropriation for the acquisition of additional forest lands?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. As the gentleman knows, the Budget made no provision for expenditures for that purpose. An amendment was offered on the floor of the House for \$25,000,000 which, as the gentleman recalls, was defeated. The Senate then proposed an amendment of \$10,000,000, and in conference we agreed on \$2,500,000.

Mr. LUCKEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to my friend from Nebraska.

Mr. LUCKEY. In reference to the reforestation program in the Great Plains section, I wish to say that I have lived there for many years. I felt that the so-called shelterbelt project was rather impractical, but there is a great possibility for reforestation in the Great Plains section if we know just exactly what should be done after a scientific study and investigation of the problem. For instance, years ago Chancellor Bessie, of the University of Nebraska, one of the leading botanists of this country, was instrumental in promoting a reforestation project in the northwestern part of Nebraska, which has now developed into a very fine forest. We also recall that Sterling Morton, who lived in Nebraska City, was a great advocate of tree planting and was the originator of Arbor Day in this country. Much good work has been accomplished. There are still great possibilities along these lines, and we should not lose sight of the fact that something should be done for the Great Plains section—the Dakotas, Nebraska, Kansas, Oklahoma, and western Texas—along the line of scientific study of what is practical for these States; and, following such a careful study, carrying out a plan in accordance with our experience and based on such scientific study.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. LUDLOW. Does not the gentleman believe that some of this enterprise ought to be left to the local initiative of the counties and States, rather than devoting the money of all the taxpayers to such work?

Mr. LUCKEY. Yes; and the States are doing a great deal of work along this line; but what we need now is a coordination of all the forces under one head, so we can go forward with as little duplication of effort and waste of money as possible in bringing forward a sound program of reforestation. Instead of going at it in a visionary way, we should proceed in the most practical way possible.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I agree with the gentleman, and unquestionably the expenditure of this money has given a salutary impetus to the cultivation of trees and reforestation studies which will bear fruit in the future. It is similar to the demonstrational work of the soil-conservation program. There is not one of those 150 conservation projects which would be justified if the only advantage accruing was to the particular section of land on which located, but they are intended to be educational, and unquestionably the work of the Government in building these units of the shelterbelt is going to bring about increased interest and better methods of farming in those sections which will encourage private enterprise to take up the work where the Government is leaving off.

Mr. PIERCE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to Governor PIERCE.

Mr. PIERCE. Do I understand that there is only two and a half million dollars appropriated for the purchase of forest lands? That is a very small percentage.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. That is one-fourth of the amount suggested by the Senate.

Mr. PIERCE. What was the amount asked for by the commission?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. There was no request to the committee in any amount. The Budget made no provision. This appropriation is in excess of the Budget.

Mr. Speaker, if there are no further inquiries, I ask for a vote on the conference report.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. McREYNOLDS). The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The question was taken, and the conference report was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will read the first amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment no. 2: Page 4, line 10, insert the following: "Provided further, That hereafter funds available for field work in the Department of Agriculture may be used for the purchase of arms and ammunition whenever the individual purchase does not exceed \$50, and for individual purchases exceeding \$50, when such arms and ammunition cannot advantageously be supplied by the Secretary of War pursuant to the act of March 3, 1879 (20 Stat. 412): *Provided further.*"

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment no. 16: On page 24, line 11, insert after the semicolon the following: "and the Secretary of Agriculture, upon application of any exporter, importer, packer, owner, agent of, or dealer in livestock, hides, skins, meat, or other animal products, may, in his discretion, make inspections and examinations at places other than the headquarters of inspectors for the convenience of said applicants and charge the applicants for the expenses of travel and subsistence incurred for such inspections and examinations, the funds derived from such charges to be deposited in the Treasury of the United States to the credit of the appropriation from which the expenses are paid."

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment no. 71: Page 75, insert, after line 6, the following: "The authorization of \$2,500,000 for the survey, construction, reconstruction, and maintenance of main roads through unappropriated or unreserved public lands, nontaxable Indian lands, or other Federal reservations other than the forest reservations, under the provisions of the act of June 24, 1930 (46 Stat., p. 805), provided for by section 6 of the Highway Act of June 18, 1934 (48

Stat., p. 994), for the fiscal year 1937, is hereby canceled for said fiscal year and made applicable to the fiscal year ending June 30, 1938."

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment no. 85: Page 90, after line 10, insert:

"Sea-food inspectors: For personal services of sea-food inspectors designated to examine and inspect sea food and the production, packaging, and labeling thereof upon the application of any packer of any sea food for shipment or sale within the jurisdiction of the Federal Food and Drugs Act, in accordance with the provisions of an act entitled 'An act to amend section 10A of the Federal Food and Drugs Act of June 30, 1906, as amended', approved August 27, 1935 (49 Stat., p. 871), \$80,000: *Provided*, That on and after July 1, 1937, receipts from fees authorized to be collected by the operations of Public Act No. 346, entitled 'An act to amend section 10A of the Federal Food and Drugs Act of June 30, 1906, as amended', shall be covered into the Treasury to the credit of 'Miscellaneous receipts', and hereafter appropriations for the operations under said act are authorized to be made annually out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated."

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House recede and concur with an amendment which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment numbered 85: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 85, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment, insert:

"Sea-food inspectors: On and after July 1, 1936, receipts from fees authorized to be collected by the operations of Public Act No. 346, entitled 'An act to amend section 10A of the Federal Food and Drugs Act of June 30, 1906, as amended', shall be covered into the Treasury to the credit of Miscellaneous Receipts, except such fees paid after June 30, 1936, on account of services rendered prior to July 1, 1936, and required for payment of obligations incurred prior to such latter date. For expenses of inspection, including personal services of sea-food inspectors designated to examine and inspect sea food and the production, packaging, and labeling thereof upon the application of any packer of any sea food for shipment or sale within the jurisdiction of the Federal Food and Drugs Act, in accordance with the provisions of an act entitled 'An act to amend section 10A of the Federal Food and Drugs Act of June 30, 1906, as amended', approved August 27, 1935 (49 Stat., p. 871), there is appropriated an amount equal to the sum received during the fiscal year 1937 from the fees hereinbefore mentioned, to be warranted monthly: *Provided*, That the sum of \$40,000 shall be advanced from the general fund of the Treasury on the first day of the fiscal year to the foregoing appropriation, to be returned to the surplus fund of the Treasury when the first \$40,000 of revenue from the aforesaid fees has been received and warranted for the fiscal year 1937."

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following substitute amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from Missouri yield for that purpose?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I do.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. COLMER: In lieu of the amendment offered by Mr. CANNON of Missouri under the title "Food and Drug Administration", subtitle "Sea-Food Inspectors", insert:

"Enforcement of the Sea-Food Inspectors' Act: For personal services of sea-food inspectors designated to examine and inspect sea food and the production, packing, and labeling thereof, upon the application of any packer of any sea food for shipment or sale within the jurisdiction of the Federal Food and Drugs Act, in accordance with the provisions of an act entitled 'An act to amend section 10 (a) of the Federal Food and Drugs Act of June 30, 1906, as amended', approved August 27, 1935 (49 Stat., p. 871), \$40,000."

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I regret that I shall have to make the point of order that the proposed amendment is not germane to the pending amendment. The amendment proposes that the Government advance \$40,000 which shall be repaid from fees; in other words, that it shall lend \$40,000 for this purpose. The amendment proposed by the gentleman from Mississippi is an outright appropriation—in other words, gratis service to the packers. The Speaker, I am certain, will recall the decision in the Sixty-fifth Congress, in which it was held that a proposition to buy could not be amended by a proposition to give. In

other words, that a proposal to give is not germane to a proposal to sell. The Speaker will also remember one of the early precedents cited by Mr. Hinds in which an amendment to pay a claim was held not to be germane to a proposition to refer a claim to the Court of Claims. The doctrine in both cases sustains the contention that a proposition to make an appropriation would not be germane to a proposition to make a loan.

I reserve my point of order in order that the gentleman from Mississippi may be heard.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I desire to be heard for a moment on the point of order, contrary to the position just taken by the gentleman from Missouri.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will be glad to hear the gentleman.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, the original Senate amendment numbered 85 is an amendment adding to the House bill an appropriation, not a loan, in the amount of \$80,000 for the payment for personal services of sea-food inspectors. The argument of my colleague Mr. CANNON would be sufficient to justify holding that the amendment submitted by the conferees in lieu of the Senate amendment, is out of order by reason of the fact that that amendment proposes a loan or advance instead of a direct appropriation, but the point of order has not been made against the amendment submitted by the conferees. The amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi as a substitute for the amendment offered by the conferees is exactly in line with the original Senate amendment numbered 85 in that it proposes a direct appropriation of \$40,000, whereas the original Senate amendment proposes a direct appropriation of \$80,000. It is inconceivable, merely by reason of the fact that the conferees have offered an amendment proposing a loan instead of an appropriation which might have been held out of order had the point of order been made, that a substitute for that amendment cannot be offered just exactly in the terms of the original Senate amendment, except as to the amount involved.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The contention of the gentleman from Georgia is that the amendment of the gentleman from Mississippi is a substitute for that is carried in the original bill as an amendment of the Senate?

Mr. TARVER. As I understand it the motion of the gentleman from Mississippi is offered as a substitute for the motion of the gentleman from Missouri to recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment, and the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi is certainly germane to the Senate amendment.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi is an amendment to the pending amendment and it is well established that the admissibility of an amendment under such circumstances is judged by its relation to the amendment to which it is offered and not by its relation to any other provision in the bill. The proposed amendment is not germane to the amendment to which it is offered.

I reserve the point of order to give the gentleman from Mississippi an opportunity to discuss his amendment.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, this appropriation is intended for the purpose of furnishing funds whereby food packed in the sea-food industry may be inspected, similar to that inspection that is granted to the meat-packing industry of this country. This is a wholesome proposition. It is in the interest of the public welfare that this sea food be inspected.

At the last session of the Congress there was a law passed authorizing this appropriation. The Pure Food and Drug Department, acting upon the authority of that authorization, asked the Budget for \$80,000.

Mr. FORD of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLMER. I yield to my colleague.

Mr. FORD of Mississippi. After the authority and the Food and Drug Department made their request of the Budget, did the Budget not approve and make its recommendation to the Appropriations Committee?

Mr. COLMER. The Budget made its recommendation to the Appropriations Committee. I thank my colleague.

Then the Senate inserted this item of \$80,000, just as we are asking in this amendment, for this purpose. We are merely asking that the recommendation of the Pure Food and Drug Department and of the Budget and of the authorization of this Congress be carried out by this appropriation, except that for the purpose of compromise, to be frank about it, instead of asking for \$80,000, we have provided for just one-half that amount or \$40,000.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLMER. I yield.

Mr. PATMAN. Is it not a fact that the gentleman is only asking for the same thing that is now granted for meats; that is, inspection by the Government?

Mr. COLMER. That is my understanding.

Mr. PATMAN. And the Budget recommended \$80,000 for that purpose and you are only asking for \$40,000 in this amendment?

Mr. COLMER. That is true.

Mr. PATMAN. I hope the amendment is adopted.

Mr. COLMER. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. THURSTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLMER. I yield.

Mr. THURSTON. The real matter in controversy is whether we should furnish a revolving fund of \$80,000, so that ultimately the fees would repay something to the Treasury, or your proposal to pay \$40,000 out of the Treasury, no part of which would be returned to the Treasury?

Mr. COLMER. That is quite true. Under the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], the distinguished chairman of this committee, we are granted \$40,000 as a kind of initial revolving fund. We are merely asking by this amendment that you give us \$40,000 without any strings tied to it. That is a frank, candid statement of the whole situation.

Let me say that this does not alone involve my selfish interest or my congressional district. This matter goes to the welfare of the consuming public. As I stated once before upon this floor, there is an opinion prevalent among the consuming public that canned sea foods are injurious and poisonous. The sea-food industry is a big industry in this country. In my district alone there are some fifteen or twenty thousand men engaged in this industry. Unless we can receive an inspection service for this sea food, and this prevalent opinion continues to grow that this product is not good for human consumption, that industry would likely be destroyed and those men will go upon relief and add to the unemployment list.

I appeal to my colleagues, not for any selfish reason but upon the merit and upon the justice of my cause, that we not twiddle about this thing, but give us this \$40,000 that we have asked for, just one-half the amount that the Budget recommended, and vote for my amendment.

I want to thank my colleague the distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON], who has been so courteous to me throughout this matter and to the cause that I represent. Even though he has seen fit, under a sense of his duty to hold down this appropriation as much as possible, to oppose me in this, I appreciate the courtesy, and I hope the amendment will prevail and that we may get this \$40,000. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. McREYNOLDS). The Chair is ready to rule upon the point of order.

The amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] to the Senate amendment appearing on page 90, line 10, with reference to sea-food inspectors, provides for a loan. The amendment reads:

Provided, That the sum of \$40,000 shall be advanced from the general fund of the Treasury on the first day of the fiscal year to the foregoing appropriation, to be returned to the surplus fund of the Treasury when the first \$40,000 of revenue from the aforesaid fees has been received and warranted for the fiscal year 1937.

The amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER] is an amendment to the amendment offered

by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] and provides for an outright appropriation of \$40,000. The difference between the amendments is that one is a loan and the other is a straight appropriation without return.

It has been well settled that an amendment to change a condition of that character is not in order. So the only question is whether or not the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi must be germane to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri or to the Senate amendment. The Chair is of the opinion, from previous rulings, that it must be germane to the amendment to which it is offered. That is, the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi must be germane to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri, because it is offered as an amendment to that amendment.

In support of that statement the Chair reads the following syllabus from Cannon's Precedents, volume VIII, section 2924:

It is not sufficient that an amendment proposed to a pending amendment be germane to the bill, but it must also be germane to the amendment to which it is offered.

In view of that situation, the Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. TARVER. In the event the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri should be voted down by the House, the gentleman from Mississippi would then be in order to offer his motion to recede and concur with his amendment to the Senate amendment?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. That is a correct statement.

The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. COLMER) there were—ayes 21, noes 28.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I ask for tellers.

Tellers were refused.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground there is not a quorum present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently there is not a quorum present. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 130, nays 147, not voting 148, as follows:

[Roll No. 112]

YEAS—130

Allen	Darrow	Larrabee	Reed, N. Y.
Andresen	Dirksen	Lesinski	Rogers, Mass.
Bacon	Dockweiler	Lewis, Colo.	Romjue
Barry	Dondero	Lord	Russell
Biermann	Duffy, N. Y.	Ludlow	Ryan
Blanton	Duncan	McAndrews	Sandlin
Boland	Ekwall	McLaughlin	Schuetz
Bolton	Engel	McLeod	Shanley
Boylan	Fletcher	Main	Shannon
Brewster	Frey	Mapes	Smith, Conn.
Buckler, Minn.	Gifford	Marshall	Spence
Burnham	Gilchrist	Martin, Mass.	Stack
Cannon, Mo.	Goodwin	Meeks	Stewart
Carlson	Guyer	Merritt, Conn.	Sumners, Tex.
Carpenter	Hancock, N. Y.	Michener	Taber
Casey	Harlan	Millard	Tarver
Christianson	Healey	Mitchell, Tenn.	Taylor, S. C.
Church	Hess	Mott	Taylor, Tenn.
Citron	Higgins, Mass.	Nelson	Thom
Cochran	Hollister	O'Brien	Thurston
Coffee	Holmes	O'Connor	Tinkham
Colden	Imhoff	O'Day	Tobey
Cole, N. Y.	Jacobsen	O'Neal	Umstead
Collins	Jenkins, Ohio	Parsons	Wadsworth
Connery	Jones	Pettengill	Welch
Costello	Kinzer	Pierce	Williams
Crawford	Kloebe	Pittenger	Wilson, Pa.
Cross, Tex.	Kniffin	Plumley	Wolcott
Crosser, Ohio	Knutson	Polk	Wolverton
Crowther	Kramer	Rabaut	Woodruff
Culkin	Lambertson	Ransley	Young
Cullen	Lambeth	Reece	
Cummings	Lamneck	Reed, Ill.	

NAYS—147

Amlie	Brown, Ga.	Clark, Idaho	Cravens
Beam	Buck	Cole, Md.	Creal
Binderup	Cartwright	Colmer	Crosby
Bland	Castellow	Cooper, Tenn.	Curley
Boileau	Chandler	Cox	Daly

Deen	Halleck	Marcantonio	Schulte
Dempsey	Hildebrandt	Martin, Colo.	Scott
DeRouen	Hill, Ala.	Mason	Scruggam
Dies	Hill, Knute	Massingale	Secrest
Dingell	Hobbs	Maverick	Smith, Va.
Disney	Hook	May	Smith, Wash.
Dorsey	Houston	Mitchell, Ill.	Smith, W. Va.
Doughton	Hull	Monaghan	Snyder, Pa.
Doxey	Jenckes, Ind.	Montague	Somers, N. Y.
Driver	Johnson, Okla.	Owen	South
Dunn, Pa.	Johnson, Tex.	Palmisano	Starnes
Edmiston	Johnson, W. Va.	Patman	Stegall
Elcher	Keller	Patterson	Stefan
Ellenbogen	Kelley	Patton	Stubbs
Faddis	Kennedy, Md.	Pearson	Terry
Farley	Kenney	Peterson, Ga.	Thomason
Fiesinger	Kociakowski	Peyser	Thompson
Flannagan	Kopplemann	Quinn	Tolan
Focht	Lemke	Ramspeck	Turner
Ford, Miss.	Luckey	Rankin	Utterback
Fuller	Lundeen	Reilly	Vinson, Ga.
Gassaway	McClellan	Richardson	Vinson, Ky.
Gavagan	McCormack	Risk	Wallgren
Gildea	McFarlane	Robertson	Walter
Gillette	McGehee	Robinson, Utah	Warren
Goldsborough	McGrath	Rogers, Okla.	Wearin
Granfield	McKeough	Sabath	Whittington
Gray, Ind.	McReynolds	Sadowski	Wilson, La.
Greenway	McSwain	Sanders, La.	Withrow
Greenwood	Mahon	Sanders, Tex.	Woodrum
Gregory	Maloney	Sauthoff	Zimmerman
Griswold	Mansfield	Schneider, Wis.	

NOT VOTING—148

Adair	Crowe	Hart	Oliver
Andrew, Mass.	Darden	Harter	O'Malley
Andrews, N. Y.	Dear	Hartley	Parks
Arends	Delaney	Hennings	Peterson, Fla.
Ashbrook	Dickstein	Higgins, Conn.	Pfeffer
Ayers	Dietrich	Hill, Samuel B.	Powers
Bacharach	Ditter	Hoeppel	Ramsay
Bankhead	Dobbins	Hoffman	Randolph
Barden	Doutrich	Hope	Rayburn
Better	Drewry	Huddleston	Rich
Bell	Driscoll	Kahn	Richards
Berlin	Duffey, Ohio	Kee	Robison, Ky.
Blackney	Dunn, Miss.	Kennedy, N. Y.	Rogers, N. H.
Bloom	Eagle	Kerr	Schaefer
Boehne	Eaton	Kleberg	Sears
Boykin	Eckert	Kvale	Seger
Brennan	Englebright	Lanham	Short
Brooks	Evans	Lea, Calif.	Sirovich
Brown, Mich.	Fenerty	Lee, Okla.	Sisson
Buchanan	Ferguson	Leibach	Snell
Buckley, N. Y.	Fernandez	Lewis, Md.	Sullivan
Bulwinkle	Fish	Lucas	Sutphin
Burch	Fitzpatrick	McGroarty	Sweeney
Burdick	Ford, Calif.	McLean	Taylor, Colo.
Caldwell	Fulmer	McMillan	Tonry
Cannon, Wis.	Gambrill	Maas	Treadway
Carmichael	Gasque	Mead	Turpin
Carter	Gearhart	Merritt, N. Y.	Weaver
Cary	Gehrmann	Miller	Werner
Cavicchia	Gingery	Montet	West
Celler	Gray, Pa.	Moran	Wheelchel
Chapman	Green	Moritz	White
Chalborne	Greever	Murdock	Wigglesworth
Clark, N. C.	Gwynne	Nichols	Wilcox
Cooley	Haines	Norton	Wolfenden
Cooper, Ohio	Hamlin	O'Connell	Wood
Corning	Hancock, N. C.	O'Leary	Zioncheck

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Until further notice:

Mr. Corning with Mr. Snell.
 Mr. Sears with Mr. Treadway.
 Mr. Bankhead with Mr. Ditter.
 Mr. Fulmer with Mr. Cooper of Ohio.
 Mr. Rayburn with Mr. Bacharach.
 Mr. Huddleston with Mr. Wolfenden.
 Mr. Buchanan with Mr. Robison of Kentucky.
 Mr. Lanham with Mr. Fish.
 Mr. McMillan with Mr. Carter.
 Mr. Drewry with Mr. Arends.
 Mr. Wilcox with Mr. Eaton.
 Mr. Mead with Mr. Hartley.
 Mr. Dickstein with Mr. Maas.
 Mr. Lea of California with Mr. Powers.
 Mr. Peterson of Florida with Mr. McLean.
 Mr. Haines with Mr. Doutrich.
 Mr. Kleberg with Mr. Turpin.
 Mr. McFarland with Mr. Leibach.
 Mr. Delaney with Mr. Blackney.
 Mr. Kerr with Mr. Andrew of Massachusetts.
 Mr. Eagle with Mr. Gwynne.
 Mr. Fernandez with Mr. Rich.
 Mr. Weaver with Mr. Seger.
 Mr. Fitzpatrick with Mr. Wigglesworth.
 Mr. Sullivan with Mr. Short.
 Mr. Bloom with Mrs. Kahn.
 Mr. Boehne with Mr. Englebright.
 Mr. Cooley with Mr. Andrews of New York.
 Mr. Burch with Mr. Cavicchia.

Mr. Cary with Mr. Fenerty.
 Mr. Bulwinkle with Mr. Burdick.
 Mr. Clark of North Carolina with Mr. Gearhart.
 Mr. Celler with Mr. Hoffman.
 Mr. Darden with Mr. Gehrmann.
 Mr. Green with Mr. Higgins of Connecticut.
 Mr. Chapman with Mr. Hope.
 Mr. Miller with Mr. Kvale.
 Mr. Taylor of Colorado with Mr. Pfeiffer.
 Mr. Belter with Mr. O'Leary.
 Mr. Carmichael with Mr. Ramsay.
 Mr. Dear with Mr. Lewis of Maryland.
 Mr. Sutphin with Mr. Driscoll.
 Mr. Werner with Mr. Boykin.
 Mr. Parks with Mr. O'Connell.
 Mr. Ashbrook with Mr. Sirovich.
 Mr. Dobbins with Mr. Montet.
 Mr. White with Mr. Claiborne.
 Mr. Greever with Mr. Ayers.
 Mr. Gasque with Mr. Hamlin.
 Mr. O'Malley with Mr. Caldwell.
 Mr. Dunn of Mississippi with Mr. Wood.
 Mr. Merritt of New York with Mr. Sweeney.
 Mr. Brown of Michigan with Mr. Hart.
 Mr. Randolph with Mr. Moran.
 Mr. Bell with Mr. Gray of Pennsylvania.
 Mr. Hennings with Mr. Buckley.
 Mr. Kee with Mr. Schaefer.
 Mr. Sisson with Mr. Eckert.
 Mr. Kennedy of New York with Mr. Ferguson.
 Mr. Tonry with Mr. Murdock.
 Mr. Evans with Mrs. Norton.
 Mr. Ford of California with Mr. Nichols.
 Mr. Adair with Mr. Hancock of North Carolina.
 Mr. Harter with Mr. Brennan.
 Mr. Richards with Mr. Barden.
 Mr. Rogers of New Hampshire with Mr. Duffey of Ohio.
 Mr. Zioncheck with Mr. Moritz.
 Mr. Brooks with Mr. Sam B. Hill.
 Mr. Gambrell with Mr. McGroarty.

Mr. DINGELL, Mr. REILLY, Mr. BARRY, Mr. KOPPLEMANN, Mr. MARTIN of Colorado, Mr. COOPER of Tennessee, Mr. STARNES, and Mr. MASSINGALE changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded. The doors were opened.

Mr. BOLAND. Mr. Speaker, my colleague the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. HAINES, is unavoidably absent. If he was present, he would vote "yea."

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I send to the desk the following motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. COLMER moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate no. 85, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter in the Senate amendment insert:

"Enforcement of the Sea Food Inspectors Act: For personal services of sea-food inspectors designated to examine and inspect sea food and the production, packing, and labeling thereof upon the application of any packer of any sea food for shipment or sale within the jurisdiction of the Federal Food and Drugs Act, in accordance with the provisions of an act entitled 'An act to amend section 10 (a) of the Federal Food and Drugs Act of June 30, 1906, as amended', approved August 27, 1935 (49 Stat., p. 871), \$40,000."

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that the proposed amendment to the Senate amendment embraces provisions that are not in conference; that the gentleman can propose only such things as are embraced within the jurisdiction of the conference; and the amendment exceeds that matter by releasing restrictions that have already been agreed to by the conferees.

The SPEAKER. As the Chair reads the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi, it contains exactly the same language as the first portion of the Senate amendment except the amount is \$40,000 instead of \$80,000.

Mr. BLANTON. But, Mr. Speaker, it releases restrictions that have been agreed upon.

The SPEAKER. In the opinion of the Chair the amendment is germane.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, only those matters that were embraced within the jurisdiction of the conferees may be offered as amendments.

The SPEAKER. This Senate amendment was reported back to the House still in disagreement, as a matter of fact, and is now before the House for such action as the House may see fit to take. The gentleman from Mississippi has

offered a motion to recede and concur in the Senate amendment with an amendment. The Chair has held that the amendment is germane and therefore overrules the point of order.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion of the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. Speaker, I congratulate the gentleman from Mississippi on this splendid tribute to his popularity in the House, and I desire to join those who voted for him in this well-merited complaint. The vote was a vote in favor of the gentleman and is a testimonial to our deep affection for him and the esteem in which he is held. It was a vote on the gentleman from Mississippi and not a vote on the merits of the amendment before us.

Mr. Speaker, I would not oppose this amendment if it involved merely the item before us today, but it is the entering wedge, and when we admit it we open the door to millions of dollars of expense in supplying similar service to other industries in the future.

Mr. Speaker, I am glad to yield such time to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER] as he may desire.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I have listened with a great deal of interest to the very impassioned plea made by my distinguished colleague from Missouri [Mr. CANNON]. I appreciate the very kind references he made to me in the beginning of his speech, but as he went along, I was reminded of the old adage, "Beware of Greeks bearing gifts", because he bore down on me pretty hard before he concluded.

Mr. Speaker, this is not a matter of personal popularity. It is true I did ask some of my colleagues to support me in this piece of legislation. It is even true I went to the door and saw a few of the Members when they came in.

You know, I was rather impressed when I first came to Congress a few years ago with the fact that every time I came in that door to answer a roll call there was a man standing there telling me to vote with the committee, or telling me how to vote. I used to resent that. He always stands there and says "The vote of the committee is yes" or "The vote of the committee is no." So today, I just took the precaution of going out there to the door in order to offset any committee action. If I did wrong, and if I was in error, I apologize. The man at the door, who usually says "Vote with the committee" retreated after I got there.

Mr. BOILEAU. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLMER. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. BOILEAU. I wish to voice my protest against a custom that has developed here of employees of the House standing at the various doors telling Members how to vote. All they say is "Vote 'yes'" or "Vote 'no.'" I wonder under what rule anyone is authorized to instruct employees of the House to stand out there and tell Members how to vote?

Mr. COLMER. I am sure it was not the distinguished chairman of this committee.

Mr. BOILEAU. Oh, I do not say that. I did not make any such inference.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, this is a serious matter. I take issue with my distinguished friend and colleague. It is on a parallel with the meat-inspection provisions of the Pure Food Act. If this inspection service is granted it can have but one purpose, and that is to protect the consuming public who consume sea-food products. If there is any food products that need inspection, I submit it is sea-food products.

The House has voted down the amendment offered by the gentleman from Missouri, which is tantamount to an endorsement of the proposal which I have made. I am not going to take the time of the House unnecessarily, because there is not a great deal involved; just \$40,000. I am asking you to take the strings off of this amount and let the people of our country have this service to the extent of \$40,000.

I hope the House will confirm what it has already done and support this motion. [Applause.]

Mr. DOXEY. Mr. Speaker, before my colleague concludes, will he yield for a question?

Mr. COLMER. I yield.

Mr. DOXEY. Is it not a fact that the Director of the Budget has approved an appropriation for this purpose in the amount of \$80,000, while all the gentleman is asking in his motion is \$40,000?

Mr. COLMER. That is quite so, and I thank my colleague.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, this is the situation with reference to the pending motion. The Senate tacked on amendment no. 85, which provided for sea-food inspection to come out of the Treasury of the United States, \$80,000, and it was provided that on and after the 1st of July 1937 receipts from fees authorized to be collected for sea-food inspection should revert to the Treasury. In conference it was worked out so that \$40,000 should be set up and then the fees should go into a revolving fund.

The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] offered an amendment providing for what the conferees had agreed to and the House voted it down. An attempt is now made to come back here and take \$40,000 out of the Treasury and not provide that the fee shall come back, which makes it a little worse than the Senate amendment and carries it way beyond the provisions of the Senate amendment so far as a raid on the Treasury is concerned.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. COLMER. Is it not a fact that the authorization passed by the Congress last year, which I do not have before me now, provided for just such an appropriation?

Mr. TABER. Not in just this way, no; because there was an authorization which required, as I recall the situation, the tax to be levied and collected from those who offered the shrimp for inspection.

Mr. COLMER. I may say to the gentleman that if he will investigate the matter further he will find he is in error.

Mr. TABER. We looked it up and we found that the Budget language that was submitted and the language submitted by the Senate did not comply with the statute.

Mr. COLMER. I may say further to the gentleman that the amendment offered now is in language prepared by the Budget.

Mr. TABER. Whether it is the language of the Budget or not, it is not language which will protect the Treasury of the United States.

I do not know who will be out in the hall asking folks to vote, but right now I am asking the membership of this House to vote to protect the Treasury and not permit this thing to go through without providing how these taxes shall be collected and how the money shall revert to the Treasury. [Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. TARVER].

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, this squabble over \$40,000, to my mind, is entirely unjustifiable. I am a member of the committee of conference which submitted the report which, so far as this amendment is concerned, the House a few moments ago, by a yea-and-nay vote, turned down. I voted with my fellow conferees in favor of the conferees' report, but our attitude was disapproved by the House. It therefore is not now a question of supporting the conferees or supporting the committee. The conference committee's attitude has already been rejected, and the question now before the House is what we ought to do to endeavor to solve this question of difference between the House and the Senate.

The Senate wants \$80,000 for this purpose, and the gentleman from Mississippi, in an effort to reach a compromise, has proposed to appropriate \$40,000. I think we ought to meet him halfway. I think we ought to agree to the amendment.

This is not any effort to raid the Treasury. If you wanted to protect the Treasury, I may say to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] he ought to have objected last year when they passed through this House a Senate bill by unanimous consent authorizing the appropriation of money from the Federal Treasury to carry on this work.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TARVER. I will be pleased to yield.

Mr. TABER. Frankly, I was not able to be here when that bill was up. I was engaged on hearings in committee. I try to protect the Treasury, but I cannot always be here and look after all these matters. I have to rely on some of the others some of the time.

Mr. TARVER. Of course, all the Members of Congress are not individually responsible for a legislative authorization which may be passed by Congress and enacted into law, but, after it is passed and signed and approved by the President, it constitutes a legislative expression of the purposes of the Congress and authorizes the appropriation of money in accordance with the collective will of Congress; and in this case legislation, subsequent to the time when the promises were made to the committee which originally considered the matter by the shrimp people, has been enacted by Congress under the unanimous-consent rule, providing that the expense of this investigation and inspection shall be paid from the Federal Treasury instead of being paid altogether by the people who are interested in the industry.

Unless we want to disapprove or repudiate the legislation we unanimously passed last year, we ought at least to make provision for a reasonable part of this expense. Forty thousand dollars will not be enough. This is unquestioned. The Budget estimated it would require \$80,000. If we agree to \$40,000, as proposed in the motion of the gentleman from Mississippi, the effect will be that the fees paid by the shrimp people themselves must pay one-half of the cost of inspection, and the Federal Government, instead of doing what it impliedly promised last year and paying it all, is going to pay one-half of it. This seems to me to be a happy and a reasonable compromise, and it certainly is my hope that the membership of the House will accede to the motion of the gentleman from Mississippi and remove this cause of controversy between the House and Senate. [Applause.]

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON].

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, like my chairman, I have no quarrel with my good friend from Mississippi [Mr. COLMER]. I merely want to say a few words in defense of the action of the Democratic employee of the House who, upon roll-call votes, stands at the door and tells incoming Members what issue is being voted upon, and who for 25 years has served the House faithfully and well, and that is Johnnie Snyder. [Applause.]

Frequently a matter comes up on the floor under debate where the committee conducts general debate for an hour or more and Members have to go in and out of the Chamber on important business. They have to meet constituents, they have to sign important documents, they go out to committee meetings, expecting to get back in time to vote by the time the question comes to a vote.

When the bell rings they come in, and then Mr. Snyder, who has served here for 25 years, served faithfully the Democratic administration of the House, stands at the door and says, "This is bill, or resolution, or amendment, or conference report so and so. The committee vote is 'aye' or the committee vote is 'no.'" He does not tell the Member how to vote. He would be the last man in the world who would tell a Member how to vote; he is one of the most modest men you ever saw, and one of the most faithful men. He is industrious and on the job every minute that the House is in session.

I frequently have to go to the Appropriations Committee's room on important business, and when I come back I say to Johnnie, "Is this vote on the committee?" I find out about the situation and then exercise my own judgment as to how to vote.

Mr. COLMER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. I will be glad to yield to my friend from Mississippi.

Mr. COLMER. I want to say to the gentleman that I had no intention of reflecting on any of these valuable employees

of the House. I hope that there is no such inference from my remarks.

Mr. BLANTON. I am glad to hear it.

Mr. BOILEAU. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. BOILEAU. Let me say that I had no intention of reflecting on any employees working at the door. My criticism was against the system and not against any employee.

Mr. BLANTON. I want to say that when the Republican Party was in power they had a faithful employee who occupied the same position that Mr. Snyder does. He stood there at the door and gave Members the facts as to the situation.

Mr. BOILEAU. And it will not be long before the Progressives will have a man standing at the door. [Laughter.]

Mr. BLANTON. Oh, the gentleman's grandchildren will be gray-headed before that time. [Laughter.]

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Mississippi.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. COLMER) there were 60 ayes and 65 noes.

Mr. COLMER. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. Evidently there is no quorum present. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 149, nays 129, not voting 147, as follows:

[Roll No. 113]

YEAS—149

Amlie	Fiesinger	McFarlane	Sanders, Tex.
Barry	Flannagan	McGehee	Sauthoff
Beam	Ford, Miss.	McGrath	Schneider, Wis.
Bell	Frey	McReynolds	Schulte
Bland	Fuller	McSwain	Scott
Bloom	Gasque	Mahon	Scrugham
Boileau	Gassaway	Maloney	Smith, Va.
Brown, Ga.	Gehrmann	Mansfield	Smith, Wash.
Buck	Gildea	Marcantonio	Smith, W. Va.
Cartwright	Goldsborough	Martin, Colo.	Snyder, Pa.
Casey	Greenway	Mason	South
Castellow	Greenwood	Massingale	Stack
Chandler	Greever	Maverick	Starnes
Chapman	Gregory	May	Steagall
Clark, Idaho	Haines	Miller	Stubbs
Colden	Hamlin	Mitchell, Ill.	Tarver
Cole, Md.	Hildebrandt	Monaghan	Taylor, Tenn.
Colmer	Hill, Ala.	Montague	Terry
Connery	Hill, Knute	Moran	Thomason
Cooley	Hobbs	Murdock	Thompson
Cooper, Tenn.	Houston	O'Connell	Tolan
Costello	Hull	O'Connor	Turner
Cox	Johnson, Okla.	O'Day	Umstead
Cravens	Johnson, W. Va.	Owen	Vinson, Ga.
Crosby	Jones	Parsons	Vinson, Ky.
Cross, Tex.	Keller	Patman	Walter
Curley	Kennedy, Md.	Patterson	Warren
Deen	Knutson	Patton	Wearin
Dempsey	Kociaikowski	Pearson	Weaver
DeRouen	Kramer	Peterson, Ga.	Welch
Dies	Kvale	Ramspeck	Whittington
Dingell	Lambeth	Rankin	Wilson, La.
Disney	Lamneck	Risk	Withrow
Doughton	Lea, Calif.	Robertson	Woodruff
Doxey	Lemke	Robinson, Utah	Woodrum
Driver	Lundeen	Rogers, Okla.	
Dunn, Pa.	McClellan	Sabath	
Ellenbogen	McCormack	Sadowski	

NAYS—129

Allen	Cole, N. Y.	Focht	Kahn
Andresen	Collins	Gavagan	Kelly
Ashbrook	Crawford	Gearhart	Kenney
Bacon	Crosser, Ohio	Gifford	Kinzer
Biermann	Crowe	Gilchrist	Kloeb
Blanton	Crowther	Goodwin	Kniffin
Boland	Culkin	Granfield	Lambertson
Boiton	Cullen	Gray, Ind.	Larrabee
Boylan	Daly	Griswold	Lesinski
Brewster	Darrow	Guyer	Lewis, Colo.
Buckler, Minn.	Dirksen	Hancock, N. Y.	Lord
Burnham	Dockweiler	Harlan	Luckey
Cannon, Mo.	Dondero	Healey	Ludlow
Cannon, Wis.	Dorsey	Hess	McAndrews
Carlson	Duffy, N. Y.	Higgins, Mass.	McKeough
Carpenter	Duncan	Hollister	McLaughlin
Christianson	Edmiston	Holmes	McLeod
Church	Elcher	Imhoff	Main
Citron	Ekwall	Jacobsen	Mapes
Cochran	Engel	Jenckes, Ind.	Marshall
Coffee	Fletcher	Jenkins, Ohio	Martin, Mass.

Meeks	Pittenger	Ryan	Thurston
Merritt, Conn.	Plumley	Sandlin	Tinkham
Michener	Polk	Schuetz	Wadsworth
Millard	Rabaut	Shanley	Williams
Mitchell, Tenn.	Reece	Shannon	Wilson, Pa.
Mott	Reed, Ill.	Smith, Conn.	Wolcott
Nelson	Reed, N. Y.	Spence	Wolverton
O'Brien	Richardson	Stefan	Young
O'Neal	Robison, Ky.	Stewart	Zimmerman
Palmisano	Rogers, Mass.	Taber	
Pettengill	Romjue	Taylor, S. C.	
Pierce	Russell	Thom	

NOT VOTING—147

Adair	Dickstein	Hoeppel	Ransley
Andrew, Mass.	Dietrich	Hoffman	Rayburn
Andrews, N. Y.	Ditter	Hook	Reilly
Arends	Dobbins	Hope	Rich
Ayers	Doutrich	Huddleston	Richards
Bacharach	Drewry	Johnson, Tex.	Rogers, N. H.
Bankhead	Driscoll	Kee	Sanders, La.
Barden	Duffey, Ohio	Kennedy, N. Y.	Schaefer
Beiter	Dunn, Miss.	Kerr	Sears
Berlin	Eagle	Kleberg	Secrest
Binderup	Eaton	Kopplemann	Seger
Blackney	Eckert	Lanham	Short
Boehne	Englebright	Lee, Okla.	Sirovich
Boykin	Evans	Lehibach	Sisson
Brennan	Faddis	Lewis, Md.	Snell
Brooks	Farley	Lucas	Somers, N. Y.
Brown, Mich.	Fenerty	McGroarty	Sullivan
Buchanan	Ferguson	McLean	Summers, Tex.
Buckley, N. Y.	Fernandez	McMillan	Sutphin
Bulwinkle	Fish	Maas	Sweeney
Burch	Fitzpatrick	Mead	Taylor, Colo.
Burdick	Ford, Calif.	Merritt, N. Y.	Tobey
Caldwell	Fulmer	Montet	Tonry
Carmichael	Gambrill	Moritz	Treadway
Carter	Gillette	Nichols	Turpin
Cary	Gingery	Norton	Utterback
Cavicchia	Gray, Pa.	O'Leary	Wallgren
Celler	Green	Oliver	Werner
Claborn	Gwynne	O'Malley	West
Clark, N. C.	Halleck	Parks	Whelchel
Cooper, Ohio	Hancock, N. C.	Peterson, Fla.	White
Corning	Hart	Peyser	Wigglesworth
Creal	Harter	Pfeifer	Wilcox
Cummings	Hartley	Powers	Wolfenden
Darden	Hennings	Quinn	Wood
Dear	Higgins, Conn.	Ramsay	Zioncheck
Delaney	Hill, Samuel B.	Randolph	

So the motion was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following additional pairs:

Additional general pairs:

Mr. Corning with Mr. Snell.
 Mr. Buchanan with Mr. Seger.
 Mr. Summers of Texas with Mr. Tobey.
 Mr. Reilly with Mr. Lehibach.
 Mr. Clark of North Carolina with Mr. Andrews of New York.
 Mr. Darden with Mr. Powers.
 Mr. Johnson of Texas with Mr. Doutrich.
 Mr. Somers of New York with Mr. Ransley.
 Mr. Creal with Mr. Hope.
 Mr. Gingery with Mr. Halleck.
 Mr. Wallgren with Mr. Berlin.
 Mr. Faddis with Mr. West.
 Mr. Tonry with Mr. Ayers.
 Mr. Whelchel with Mr. Secrest.
 Mr. Utterback with Mr. Quinn.
 Mr. Sirovich with Mr. Hook.
 Mr. Binderup with Mr. Parks.
 Mr. Randolph with Mr. Dietrich.
 Mr. Lee of Oklahoma with Mr. Cummings.
 Mr. Oliver with Mr. Farley.
 Mr. Peyser with Mr. Gray of Pennsylvania.
 Mr. Sanders of Louisiana with Mr. Gillette.

Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee and Mr. WELCH changed their votes from "no" to "aye."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next amendment in disagreement.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment no. 86: Page 91, strike out "\$1,975,217" and insert "\$2,579,837."

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following motion, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. CANNON of Missouri moves that the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 86, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "\$2,077,758."

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Missouri.

The motion was agreed to.

Motions to reconsider the various votes by which the several motions were agreed to were laid on the table.

LEAVE TO FILE REPORT

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may have until tomorrow night at 12 o'clock to file committee report upon H. R. 12869, and that the minority may have the same right to file minority views.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

ODESSA MASON

Mr. REECE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 1252) for the relief of Odessa Mason, with a committee amendment thereto, and agree to the committee amendment.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the committee amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "not otherwise appropriated" and insert "allocated by the President for the maintenance and operation of the Civilian Conservation Corps."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the committee amendment.

The Senate amendment was agreed to; and a motion to reconsider the vote by which the Senate amendment was agreed to was laid on the table.

LOOKING TO THE CAMPAIGN

Mr. HANCOCK of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by inserting therein an address delivered by my colleague from New York [Mr. ANDREWS] on May 27 over a national hook-up of the National Broadcasting System.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HANCOCK of New York. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following radio address delivered by Hon. WALTER G. ANDREWS, of New York, on May 26, 1936:

Members of the national radio audience, as a radio fan myself I am mindful of the fact that in these days you are invited to listen to a lot of so-called political orators, and as a speaker this evening I wish to avoid, if possible, being put into that class. My time on the air with you is brief, so I shall confine myself to some observations which I believe are pertinent. Looking to the campaign. These for your information are based upon 5 years' service in the House of Representatives, a reasonable business experience, and contacts largely with my fellow citizens in New York State. In talking with you I may also state that I am one of those who believe that, given the facts and a fair understanding in any situation, the average citizen is better qualified today to exercise his or her political judgment than at any time in our history. Largely due to the development of the press in its news from Washington, and in particular the radio, a vast majority of our citizens are much better informed than ever before.

We have now witnessed over 3 years of the so-called New Deal, and what are to be our considerations looking to the campaign and the election? At the start, to be sure, some of the early expressions of Mr. Roosevelt and some of the measures sponsored by his leadership gave us hope for the solution of our pressing problems, but this did not last for long.

Mr. Roosevelt's personal charm lasted about 2 years, and even before that the failure of his policies became evident. At the outset, having no real or sound convictions of his own, Mr. Roosevelt surrounded himself with a group of impractical theorists. It is this group, to a large extent, who have supplied the ideas of the New Deal. It is interesting to note that among the entire group of departmental bureaucratic advisers of the President it would be most difficult to find one self-made man or anyone who from experience knows what it is to meet a Saturday night's pay roll or manage a farm. Looking to the Democratic National Convention and Mr. Roosevelt's renomination, how can his 1936 platform be anything but meaningless. Here is a man who promised to reduce Federal expenditures. He has increased them enormously. He has cynically violated most of the other major planks of his 1932 platform.

Figures taken from the books of the Treasury Department itself show that up to May 18 last the Federal Government, under the present administration, has expended the colossal sum of twenty-two and one-half billion dollars. Putting this long figure another way, twenty-two thousand million dollars. The magnitude of this spending becomes more alarming when you realize that during this period the Government has been putting out more than \$2 for each dollar of revenue it has taken in. The administration right now is in a hot spot. It is unwilling if not afraid to cut expenditures at the moment. It is equally unwilling and probably afraid

to impose the added taxes which would be required to bring the revenues somewhere near its expenditures.

It was the President himself who once said, "Taxes are paid by the sweat of every man who labors." The people must be assured that Government borrowing will stop as soon as possible, thus releasing funds for private enterprise. Honest relief must be provided for those who require it, but the Republican Party cannot attempt to follow the present administration's wasteful policy. The New Deal administration is about to go into a national election. What is it going to do after election if it be successful in retaining control of the Government? If its future is to be judged by its past performances, the spending will continue, along with its experiments.

The second count against Mr. Roosevelt is his disregard of American tradition. Attempts to intimidate a free people through the N. R. A., the A. A. A., the Potato Act, and other similar devices have failed. Mr. Farley's attempt to buy the election of 1936 through the political domination of W. P. A. workers, corruption of the civil service, and wholesale patronage disposal to hundreds of thousands of additions to the Federal pay roll will not prevail against the rising tide of sane thinking among the voters. Everywhere allegiance to Roosevelt and Farley is a requisite for getting a W. P. A. job. Hunger and anxiety to work are not enough. Desperate tactics are being employed by Roosevelt, Farley & Co., for they are not so sure of winning as they would have you believe. But these tactics will not succeed as in 1932 and 1934. The people have awakened. The majority of them will not endorse a national Tammany Hall bossed by a stamp seller, chairman of the New York Democratic Committee, chairman of the National Democratic Committee, and ex-officio Postmaster General. If Mr. Roosevelt is sincere in some of his early expressed ideals for the Federal Government, why doesn't he listen to the pleadings of his friend Senator NORRIS, who asks that Mr. Farley resign one of his jobs? When have we ever heard of such brazen thirst for political power in one man on this side of the Atlantic? Mr. Farley is a smart man, but he made a bad mistake the other day during his private-car trip through the country, while in Michigan. He included in his talk a reference to one of the Republican candidates as "merely the Governor of a typical prairie State." This shows what the Tammany national chairman thinks of the Middle West. No matter who the Republican candidate may be, Farley's crack should be plastered on every fence post in the Mississippi Valley.

The third count against the President is from a practical standpoint probably the most damaging of all. He has failed to reduce unemployment appreciably, in spite of all his spending, with an increase in the national debt from twenty-one to thirty-four billions of dollars. American Federation of Labor statistics place present unemployment at about the same as in September of 1933. Roosevelt's petulant attacks on American businessmen merely expose his own incompetence. It is his vacillating and undependable policies which prevent the average man in business from making any long-range plans. The result is a vast amount of idle capital. Our successful Presidents have in the main cooperated with businessmen and with all other classes, instead of denouncing them. Our heritage has been that the Government has been the servant of the people and not their master.

The fourth count against Mr. Roosevelt is his deliberate creation of class hatred, his attempt to buy the votes of the farmers and those who want honest work. In order to fight depression the wisest, as well as the most honest, course to adopt is the encouragement of unity among Americans. It is the duty of a President to set an example of faith, hope, and charity. This last quality is conspicuously absent in the President. His self-complacency attributes to all opponents an unworthy motive. He has done a good deal to discredit the word "liberal" as applied to the political world. Matthew Arnold, a genuine social reformer, who once described himself as a liberal of the future, asserted that a liberal must keep himself free from petty hatreds and prejudice. There are none like him in the New Deal gang. They resent criticism no matter from whom it comes.

The best that can be said about Mr. Roosevelt is that he is a pleasant man, but shallow on fundamentals and pleasant only when he is not opposed.

His record furnishes us with no reason for entrusting him with the conduct of national affairs for another 4 years. Under his confused and spendthrift rule the Nation has been hurried toward eventual bankruptcy. Leading Democrats have protested these policies in vain. Many good Democrats, who voted for him in 1932, are now joining in this chorus. The country is not going to revolt in November. It has already revolted. The determination to turn to sound principle has already been made by the people. This is apparent everywhere. The only question to be immediately decided is into whose hands to place the new leadership. This question is to be decided at Cleveland next month, which brings me before closing to a few words to the Republican voters and delegates to the national convention.

Herein rests our great responsibility. I believe it paramount that every Republican urge his or her delegate to use their influence to elect the strongest possible candidate with the adoption of a platform devoid of bunk and capable of performance. It should be straightforward, concise, and clearly stating the honest and actual intentions of the Republican leadership.

For the last 3 years we have been at the mercy of the Roosevelt-Farley gang, who have posed as the Democratic Party while violating almost every fundamental principle upon which that party has

formerly stood. The Republican Party must appeal to persons of moderate circumstances and moderate frame of mind and to the young people of our country looking to the future. Those in moderate circumstances are the backbone of America. The everyday man and woman of America, the heads of families, have a great stake in the Republican Party. Only through it can their families, their homes, their savings, and their ideals find protection against rising socialism and its great bureaucracy.

If the Republican Party should nominate a man who is merely the heir of old and broken-down machine politics, a man who has not rubbed elbows with his fellow men, we had better close up shop today. But we will not nominate such a man.

With this the Republican Party will represent common sense over socialism, common honesty over crazy bureaucracy, common decency over a lower code. If we will give this great majority in this country of common men and women the chance to make the choice, there can be no question of a victory in November. It will be a victory for American traditions and principles.

THE DISTRICT APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend in the RECORD dated tomorrow a copy of a letter addressed to the chairman of the Senate conferees on the District of Columbia appropriation bill, answering a letter I have just received from him, and outlining a matter coming into conference on Monday morning next between the House and the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent extend in the RECORD a copy of a letter dated tomorrow the chairman of the Senate conferees on the District of Columbia appropriation bill.

The letter is as follows:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., May 30, 1936.

Senator ELMER THOMAS,

Chairman, Senate Conferees, District Appropriation Bill,
Senate Office Building.

MY DEAR SENATOR THOMAS: Your letter of May 29 (embracing 5 pages, typewritten, single-spaced) addressed to me as chairman of the House conferees, copies of which at the time of sending you gave yesterday to the five Washington newspapers for publication, is before me for reply.

Your procedure, Senator, is most unusual and unprecedented. We five House managers invited you and the other Senate managers to meet us in conference next Monday, hoping that it might be possible then to reach an agreement on the 87 Senate amendments you placed on the House appropriation bill. You could have telephoned your acceptance. It required no five-page letter. Yet on Friday, when agreeing to meet us in conference next Monday, you made an attempt to prejudice and predetermine all of the issues of the conference, by making an extended argument in your five-page letter, given front-page notoriety last night and this morning by your personally interested ardent backers—the local newspapers.

I won't complain, however, Senator, but accept the situation with much gratification, because your unprecedented action inviting from me a reply, affords me a most apropos opportunity, thus by you made both parliamentary and proper, frankly and fully to place before you and the public the exact position of the House conferees, which you and your forum, the interested Washington newspapers, continue to ignore and misrepresent, and with erroneous statements and counterfeit logic seek to avoid.

We are not going to let you side-step the issues or misrepresent the facts or shift the responsibility. You placed 87 Senate amendments on the House bill, which, without question or consideration, passed the Senate in 15 minutes, as so reported by all local newspapers. Your 87 Senate amendments involved millions of dollars, 6 being legislative matters that should have been reported only by a legislative committee. One is to establish pay parking meters in Washington, so that every person who parks an automobile in their Nation's Capital would be forced to pay tribute to one monopoly. You did not expect the House to agree to your 87 amendments, because you asked for a conference and had Senate conferees appointed immediately, before any House Member had seen any of your 87 amendments, and the local papers immediately quoted you as saying that the House would be compelled to agree to the Senate action or there would be no bill, and you would pass a continuing resolution.

In your first amendment you demanded that the taxpayers of the United States should contribute, out of their Federal Treasury, the huge sum of \$5,700,000 on the local civic expenses of the Washington people. You at the time had access to the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, which showed that when such proposal was made in the House only 11 Members voted for it, and that upon a record roll-call vote in the House the bill passed allowing a contribution of only \$2,700,000, with only 26 Members voting against it.

Then, again, you knew that the House subcommittee had held exhaustive hearings on the request of Superintendent Ballou to give him \$78,660 to be spent on his so-called character education, and that the House committeemen, by a unanimous vote, had decided that the \$87,540 you allowed Ballou last year, and the \$63,383 you allowed him the year before, had been wasted, misspent, and

perversed; that he was using it on only 10 of his 175 schools, and was doing no good, but lots of harm; and they unanimously refused to allow any part of the \$78,660, and the House approved their action by passing the bill, with only 26 Members voting against it on record roll-call vote. Yet, by amendment, you had the Senate to place this \$78,660 in the bill for Dr. Ballou to waste and misspend.

Then, again, you knew that through hearings the House subcommittee had ascertained that judges drawing salaries of from \$8,000 to \$12,500, and prosecuting attorneys drawing large salaries up to \$8,000, and doctors drawing salaries up to \$7,500, and other employees drawing high salaries were selling part of their time to outside employers, and the House provided in its bill that no such official or employee drawing as much as \$2,400 per year should accept outside employment, and you placed a Senate amendment on our bill, striking out this House limitation, which was included in the House bill which passed with only 26 votes against it on roll-call record vote.

I firmly believe that 95 percent of the people of Texas would strongly support the House on the above three issues. I firmly believe that in spite of your tremendous popularity in your own State, and the honor and eulogies your five Washington newspapers daily bestow upon you for fighting their battles, that 90 percent of the people of Oklahoma would strongly support the House on all three of the above issues.

Yet, Senator, you have held this bill in deadlock since April 24, 1936, notwithstanding the fact that in a final effort to get a bill so that the District of Columbia would not be deprived of some urgent, badly needed, new construction and equipment the House conferees proposed that if the Senate would yield on the three propositions above mentioned that the House conferees most generously would yield on the other 84 Senate amendments. You refused. You claimed that an expert named Parker, and Mr. Richards, had given convincing proof that Washington people were overtaxed and we asked to be allowed to question them, and you arranged for the Senate and House conferees to meet in joint hearing on May 7, 1936, to hear Parker and Richards.

We met together on May 7, 1936, to hear Parker and Richards and, to our surprise, you had no stenographer there to take down the evidence. We asked that you call one of the official stenographers, as we wanted the evidence taken down and printed, so that it would be of some value. To our great surprise, you obstinately refused to have a stenographer or to have it taken down, so all five of our House managers refused to sit with you in the hearing, as your arbitrary action caused all of us to have suspicions regarding the entire proceeding. We all withdrew and learned afterward that you then sent for a stenographer, and, with our House conferees absent and with no opportunity for any of us to ask the witnesses questions, you proceeded to allow them to introduce a lot of irrelevant, erroneous documents and statements which, had we been present, we could have made them admit, through pertinent questioning, were of no value and had no probative force and effect whatsoever; yet you had same printed into a worthless document of 53 printed pages.

We House conferees finally succeeded in getting this Mr. L. H. Parker before us on May 13, 1936, and we elicited from him facts that you made no attempt to develop. We made him admit that he is drawing an annual salary of \$9,600 from the Government, yet last October accepted employment from the Washington Board of Trade, and that they paid him \$5,500 in cash for his absurd, ridiculous statement that "Washington is the third highest taxed city in the United States." Every posted person in Congress knows there is no truth whatever in such statement. His 26 pages of testimony in our printed hearings show that Parker does not know anything whatever about Washington taxes.

Parker was in error about the date he bought his own home, and as to what he paid for it, and as to its assessed value. He testified that he bought it new in 1929, when he bought it in 1931; he testified he paid \$17,250 for it, when he paid \$17,950 for it; he testified that during the 3 years he owned it it was assessed at \$14,000, when during said time it was assessed at \$11,010 and it is now assessed at only \$10,110; he testified he paid an automobile tax of \$18, when the tax official, Mr. Allen, certifies that he paid only \$2, of which \$1 was a property tax on his auto and the other \$1 was for registration and annual license tags.

I will guarantee that neither the people of Texas nor Oklahoma would give any credence to the evidence of a man who had been paid \$5,500 in cash for giving it.

As to Mr. Richards, since he has lately gotten on the board of trade pay roll, he has suddenly changed front from the evidence he has been giving us for the past 20 years. He won't deny that in 1927 the tax rate here was \$1.80 per \$100; that in 1928 the Commissioners lowered the tax rate to \$1.70 per \$100, and he was present, assenting to Commissioner Hazen's testimony in 1934 that "for 1934 they had lowered the tax rate from \$1.70 to \$1.50 per \$100, which meant a saving that year to Washington taxpayers of \$2,445,000; also that they had reduced the assessed valuation of real estate by \$80,000,000, which meant another saving of \$1,200,000, and for 1935 they were making an additional reduction in assessed valuation of real estate of \$50,000,000; that they had given a 25-percent reduction in water charges, which meant another saving of \$600,000, as they had increased the metered allowance from 7,500 to 10,000 cubic feet; and they were allowing 10 percent discount on bills, which meant another saving of \$100,000 to local taxpayers.

Mr. Richards assenting thereto then heard Commissioner Hazen admit the many privileges Washington people enjoy, and the many exemptions from ordinary taxes they have which people in

other cities have to pay, and heard Commissioner Hazen testify that Washington people are the best cared for, are the least taxed, and enjoy more privileges than any other people in the United States.

You, Senator, and your conferees, made no attempt to elicit from Mr. Richards the reason for his change of front. We have a certificate from Maj. Daniel J. Donovan, auditor of the District, showing that instead of retiring on March 14, 1936, with retired pay for life of \$1,265 per annum, payable in 12 equal monthly installments every year, Mr. Richards resigned on March 12, 1936, and will now draw no retired pay. He did this so he could go on the pay roll of the Washington Board of Trade. Many times he has testified that property here wanted by the Government has cost us as high as 10 times its assessed value, based on the evidence of Washington experts. Hence we do not pay any attention to his change-of-front testimony now, since he has gone on the pay roll of the Washington Board of Trade. When it has paid Parker \$5,500 for giving them a worthless statement, it must be paying Mr. Richards pretty high compensation to induce him to waive his retired pay for life.

You contend, Senator, that taxes are not extremely low here. How about your own. You own your own apartment in the large apartment house at No. 1661 Crescent Place NW. There are 49 other apartments in this building owned by individuals like yourself, all taxed together as one piece of property. In 1933 this property embracing the 50 apartments was rendered at an assessed valuation of \$687,450, upon which at the then tax rate of \$1.70 on the \$100, there was paid a tax of \$11,686.66, your one-fiftieth of same being \$233.73. This year said property embracing said 50 apartments is rendered at an assessed valuation of only \$597,705, which is a reduction in assessed value of \$89,745 since 1933, and the tax paid this year at the reduced tax rate of only \$1.50 per the \$100, is \$8,965.58, your one-fiftieth part of same being only \$179.31, if yours is an average of said 50 apartments. The above facts were certified to us by the tax assessor of the District of Columbia, who further shows that above your \$1,000 household-furniture exemption allowed you here by law, you render \$500 of household furniture upon which you pay an annual tax of only \$7.50, and that your 1935-model family sedan is rendered at an assessed value of \$785, upon which you pay a property tax of only \$11.77, and that you pay \$1 per year for your registration license tags. Don't you know, Senator, that the property you own here would cost you at least three times as much taxes per annum in Oklahoma or Texas as the amount you pay here in Washington?

In our House hearings we showed the actual renditions of all the newspapers in Washington and of about a hundred citizens drawing salaries of from \$20,000 to \$75,000 per year, and none of them would think of selling their property for double its assessed value, and some of them were paying \$2 and \$3 per annum on their family Cadillacs and Packards.

Your first bluff was that you would make the House give a Federal contribution of \$5,700,000 by passing a continuing resolution, but we called that by assuring you the House would amend it, and refuse to allow it.

Then you bluffed again by stating you would force the President to pay the District expenses out of Federal relief funds so as to make all of the expense be borne by the United States, and the President called that bluff by stating he would use no relief funds for such purpose.

Now in your letter you bluff again by threatening to pass your ridiculous resolution to let the President appoint three men of the qualifications you specify, to decide what amount of Federal contribution Congress shall give to Washington people, and that we appropriate \$50,000 to pay these men. And in your letter you say "the Government of the District of Columbia is the direct and unavoidable responsibility of the President." I thought you were acquainted with the Constitution. The President does not have any control whatsoever over the District of Columbia. It is not his concern. The Constitution provides that "the Congress shall exercise exclusive control." Watson on the Constitution, page 698, says: "The Constitution confers upon Congress absolute control and authority over the District of Columbia." In *Gibbons v. The District of Columbia*, and numerous other cases, the Supreme Court of the United States held that under clause 17, of section 8, of article I of the Constitution "Congress is given exclusive jurisdiction over the District of Columbia for every purpose of government, national or local, in all cases whatsoever, including taxation." So the President has nothing to do with it. It is solely a responsibility of the Congress. And we are not going to allow you to shift it to the shoulders of the President. He appoints the Commissioners solely because Congress delegated that authority to him by statute.

Of course we know who would select the three men you have in mind. The Senate selects all judges, all prosecuting attorneys, all directors, all commissioners, all administrators, all heads of bureaus—all this and all that. You might, Senator, accidentally select some fellow like Parker, who, without your having found it out, had gotten on the pay roll of the Washington Board of Trade at \$5,500 cash per high tax opinion, or you might accidentally select some fellow like Richards, who resigns without retirement pay so he can work for the Washington Board of Trade, when he could have retired and drawn retired pay for life of \$1,265 per annum, which is a pretty fair pension.

What is the use of paying \$50,000 to your three men when only last year President Roosevelt had his Treasury experts to make an investigation of taxes paid in 15 comparable cities, and he certified

to us that the taxes paid in Washington are lower than those paid in any other cities of between 300,000 and 825,000 population in the United States.

Have you forgotten the long, expensive, exhaustive investigation made by the Mapes committee, which found taxes here so low they immediately had the House pass the four Mapes bills, increasing the gasoline tax, the tax on automobiles and trucks, providing an income tax, and other taxes that people in all other cities pay, and all of said bills died in the Senate. We are not going to waste another \$50,000 on any worthless commission.

Before I conclude, Senator, I must remind you of a few of the things the United States has done for the District. It has made out of a swampy, unhealthy, mosquito-ridden, small town, one of the finest, most beautiful cities in the world, where lots that formerly you could hardly give away, are now worth a fortune. It owns the original water conduit here, and has spent over \$20,000,000 out of the Federal Treasury in perfecting the water system. It has built the Washington Monument, the Lincoln Memorial and reflecting pools used for skating in winter, the \$14,750,000 Memorial Bridge, the wonderful new boulevard highway to Mount Vernon, the \$10,000,000 Supreme Court Building, the magnificent Congressional Library, and scores of other remarkable places of interest, all with United States money, that attract hundreds of thousands of tourists here constantly. The Washington Star for April 26, 1936, quoted the board of trade as stating that during the last 5 years visitors to Washington had spent the enormous sum of \$221,547,992 in cash, which greatly benefited every businessman in Washington.

Moreover, under the old regime, the Government paid all of the debts incurred by the District, and has kept it out of debt with large annual contributions from the Federal Treasury, so people here pay no interest.

And under the old unjust 50-50 arrangements, the United States furnished half of the money to install the sewer system here, to pave the streets, to build the many fine bridges, including the million-dollar bridge on Connecticut Avenue, to build most of the 175 school buildings of Washington, to procure and develop the numerous fine playgrounds, the 1,200 parks, big and little, the jail, penitentiary, the courts, the municipal building, the markets, some hospitals, branch libraries, and many other permanent improvements which people of all other cities must buy and pay for themselves without help.

People in other cities have to pay State taxes, county taxes, school taxes, water taxes, and many other special taxes. Here in Washington people pay one tax of \$1.50 on the \$100 on both tangible personal property and on real estate. They pay only one-half of 1 percent on intangibles. They get their water furnished for only \$6.60 per year for an average family, with a 10-percent discount on that when paid within 15 days after due. They pay only 2 cents gasoline tax, when it is 7 cents in Tennessee, 5 cents right over here in Virginia, and 4 cents right over here in Maryland, plus a sales tax. They pay only \$1 per year for registration and license tags on automobiles and trucks, no matter whether they are a fourth-hand Ford or a \$12,000 new Rolls Royce. They are allowed \$1,000 of household furniture exempt from all taxes. They have the wearing apparel, whether worth \$5 or \$50,000, exempt from taxes. They have their private libraries, whether worth \$5 or \$50,000, exempt from all taxes. They have their ashes gathered free, their trash gathered free, and their garbage gathered free. They pay no monthly or yearly charge for sewer service. They do not have to pay for repairing or repaving of streets contiguous to their property. They do not have to pay for repairing or repaving sidewalks around their property. The shade and ornamental trees in front of their property are furnished free, have fences built around them free to protect the first few years of early growth, are pruned free, are sprayed free, are cared for free, and are replaced free when they die. Other than the Federal taxes that people in all cities pay, the Washington people pay no estate tax, no inheritance tax, no gift tax, no income tax, and no sales tax.

The Washington people enjoy the pansy beds, the rose gardens, the cherry blossoms, the flower-covered Hains Point Drive, the Capitol, the Congressional Library, the national functions, all without cost to them.

No wonder that Commissioner Hazen was forced to truthfully say that "Washington people were better treated, were least taxed, and enjoyed more privileges than any other people in the United States."

You speak about the "voiceless people of Washington." They are not voiceless. They have you and other Senators fighting all the time to give them everything they want. I am thinking of the "voiceless people of Texas", the "voiceless people of Oklahoma", who can't be heard here when you are taking \$5,700,000 of their money out of the Treasury and giving it to Washington people. I am making my fight to protect the people of Texas, and the people of Oklahoma, and the people of the other States from having to make an unjust contribution on the annual taxes of Washington people.

I have discussed the matter with many of my House colleagues, and they assure me that this is one time they are not going to knuckle down to these unreasonable demands. The newspapers have misrepresented and misquoted the Speaker on this subject. They have misrepresented and misquoted the President about it. The President knows just how pampered Washington people are, and he is not going to be unjust to the other 120,000,000 people of the United States just to give this handsome \$5,700,000 birthday present to Washington people every year.

You speak of the President's Budget. Congress goes under and over it all the time. It merely fixes a maximum. The President expects Congress to keep under it, otherwise there would be no need of Congress. We could all stay at home and let the Budget estimates be spent. You, however, have already realized to what

an impossible extreme your contention about the Budget has carried you, for the Budget does not authorize the Eastern High School, or the Police Court Building, or the Chain Bridge, or the needed fire trucks and apparatus.

As none of the Washington papers would dare to publish this letter, my only means of getting the facts of this situation before the American public, is to publish it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and, fortunately, the House granted me consent to do so last evening before we adjourned. We House conferees are willing to meet you Monday on the 87 Senate amendments, and see whether we can reach an agreement, which I believe is preferable to any continuing resolution.

Respectfully submitted.

THOMAS L. BLANTON,
Chairman, House Conferees.

DEMOCRATIC ACHIEVEMENTS

Mrs. O'DAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an address delivered by the Postmaster General.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mrs. O'DAY. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD I include the following address of Postmaster General James A. Farley, Democratic National and State chairman, at a testimonial dinner given in his honor at the Onondaga Hotel, Syracuse, N. Y., Thursday night, May 21, 1936, 7 p. m., by the Onondaga County Democratic committee, and broadcast over radio stations WFBL and WFYR, both of Syracuse:

It is a great pleasure for me to join with my friends of central New York in this fine gathering that has assembled for the purpose of lending further impetus to the sweeping wave of Democracy. We are nearing the time of the national convention and national campaign with increasing enthusiasm everywhere, which is indicative of the even greater confidence that a confident people have in the leadership of our President, Franklin D. Roosevelt.

His leadership has been on behalf of the great mass of our people. He has realized, more than anyone else before him, that our national prosperity depends upon the prosperity of all our people, and it would be well for those more abundant in wealth to delve deeply into the facts beyond this simple truth, for if they did they would find that even they would profit more if those less favored prospered more.

Their nearsightedness in this regard is unexplainable. No one has reason to know this more than the people of New York State, who have lately witnessed the sorry spectacle of the so-called young stalwarts in the Republican assembly blocking by obstructionist methods the benefits accruing from the National Social Security Act. Because of the stupid tactics of a stupid opposition a grave injustice is being done the sick, the infirm, the crippled, and the aged of this State for no logical reason whatever.

The battle waged on behalf of the State Social Security Act by our Democratic legislators, and by those Republican legislators whose intelligence surpassed their partisanship, is fresh in your memory. We have reason to be thankful that this whole question was kept before the people right up to the closing days of the legislature by the battle waged by our militant Governor. I say with all sincerity that the unceasing struggle in this fight made by him insures by a greater plurality than ever the reelection this fall of a Democratic Governor and our entire Democratic State ticket.

I predict that the Democrats will not only retain their strength in the State senate but I also prophesy that the anger of our people against those who refused to do the right thing by the crippled, the sick, the aged, and infirm will result in the defeat of a great number of Tory assemblymen and may again give our party the control of the lower house, as was the case in 1935, when a complete Democratic administration gave the people of the State the finest program of legislation ever enacted.

In the field of national affairs I know of no way to more clearly bring out the barrenness of the opposition than to ask a few simple and plainly understandable questions:

Have you noticed that none of the enemies of President Roosevelt invite a comparison between what he has done and what was done under the Republicans?

Have you noticed that none of his critics invite a comparison between the condition of the farmers under Roosevelt and under Hoover?

Have you noticed that not one of these pompous "saviors of America" invite a comparison between the more than 6,000 bank failures under Republican rule and the less than 400 under Roosevelt, and under Roosevelt the depositors of the closed banks were saved millions of dollars under the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation?

Have you noticed that even Hoover does not ask you to compare the production of the great basic industries under his administration with the production under Roosevelt?

Have you noticed that the spokesmen of predatory interests do not ask a comparison between the trade of retail stores throughout the country during the Hoover and Roosevelt administrations?

Have you noticed that these champions of the old deal do not dare talk about conditions in the last 4 years of the old deal?

Have you noticed that all their speeches are appeals to the big-money interests and find no time for a discussion of the rights and conditions of the masses of the people?

Have you noticed that Chairman Fletcher, who manages the old-deal campaign, instead of boasting of principles and enunciating policies, confines his boasting to the amount of money his people are able to raise to put an end to government by the people?

Have you noticed that the old deal has not yet submitted substitute plans for the Roosevelt policies, and that its spokesmen are as barren of constructive suggestions on raising the depression now as they were during the last 4 Republican years when our condition grew more desperate with each succeeding month?

Have you noticed how all those called by Theodore Roosevelt "the malefactors of great wealth" are united against Franklin D. Roosevelt?

If you have not noticed, notice now, and meditate on the meaning.

There is a meaning that requires no great brain to figure out. Whether it is abysmal ignorance or sheer dishonesty, the constant reference by themselves and by the press to the special pleaders of the predatory interests as Jeffersonians and Jacksonians is grotesque.

No Jacksonian or Jeffersonian at any time in history would have been permitted to contaminate the rarified atmosphere of that precious company. It represented more openly than ever before in the country's record the "ganging up" of the privileged against the people and a people's government.

But it was not the first time these privileged few have "ganged up." They "ganged up" against Jefferson, fought him tooth and nail, denounced him constantly, and everywhere ostracized his followers from the drawing rooms of the fashionable and the favored.

They "ganged up" with a vengeance against Jackson—referred to him as a Socialist, an ignoramus, a creature of the mob, unfit to associate with gentlemen, and ostracized his followers from their assemblages.

The purpose of the New Deal is—

To end privilege, which was the heart of the purpose of Jefferson and Jackson.

To protect the interests and proper opportunities of the average man, which was the soul of the programs of Jefferson and Jackson.

To make government the instrument of the people for the service of all the people, which was the fight made by Jefferson and Jackson.

To make impossible the dictatorship of money, which was the basis of the struggles of both Jefferson and Jackson.

To prevent by proper laws the rule of monopoly and autocracy, which was what called down on Jefferson and Jackson the hatred of the seekers of privilege.

Both Jefferson and Jackson stood for constitutional government precisely as Franklin D. Roosevelt stands for it.

And both were denounced by the Federalists and Whigs of their day as wreckers of the Constitution—as Roosevelt is today.

There was scarcely a single measure of Jefferson's administration that was not denounced as a violation of the Constitution. This is not hyperbole for the purpose of making a startling statement. The facts are:

That when Jefferson repealed the judiciary act passed in the last hours before his inauguration to pack the Federal courts with enemies of democracy, they said he was violating the Constitution.

When he demanded a constitutional amendment on the election of Presidents, he was ferociously attacked for "destroying the Constitution."

When he gave us the embargo law, he was hysterically denounced by certain business interests for violating the Constitution.

It would be hard to find a single Federalist speech made in Congress or a single editorial in a Federalist paper through the 8 years of his Presidency in which Jefferson was not held out as a violator of the Constitution and a wrecker of "American institutions."

And that which was true of Jefferson was just as true of Jackson. He was continuously abused as a wrecker of the Constitution during the 8 years of his Presidency.

It was a lie about Jefferson and Jackson—and just as much of a lie about Roosevelt.

But Jefferson did act beyond the Constitution once, and consciously. It was when he acquired the vast empire of Louisiana by purchase.

He knew what we all know now—that the acquisition of this territory, removing it from the clutches of Europe, was necessary to the future of the Nation. He knew that failure peaceably to secure it would probably mean war. Everyone agreed to that. And when he found he could buy it, he bought it.

But he could not thus acquire it without going beyond the Constitution. He might have asked for a constitutional amendment. He thought about it. But at the time Spain was protesting to France, and France was winning her battles in the war, and delay might easily have been fatal to the purchase. He was unwilling to sacrifice the vital interest of the Nation at such a time. And so he bought and kept Louisiana without an amendment. He did not believe that when the life of the Nation and the vital interest of the people were at stake that he could justify a gamble.

When we want an opinion of Jeffersonian or Jacksonian democracy we will not go to public men whose whole careers has been built on the Hamiltonian or anti-Jefferson theory of government.

We prefer to go to history and to the published works of Jefferson and Jackson.

Just as these men fought the battle of the common people, Roosevelt is fighting it today. Just as they were the pet aversions of the plutocrats of their day, Roosevelt is today. Just as they were denounced for violating the principle of constitutional government, Roosevelt is today. Just as they were pictured constantly as destroying American institutions, Roosevelt is today. Just as they were said to be arraying class against class, Roosevelt is today.

And just as Jefferson and Jackson prevailed over the plutocracy of their time, Roosevelt is today.

And his victory will come because truth will prevail over the distortion of facts being issued as opposition propaganda.

The old dealers are clearly not prepared in attacking the New Deal to invite comparisons with the old. The strategy agreed upon is to leave the old deal out of consideration at all. But since the old dealers want the old deal back, and if successful at the polls propose to bring it back, the comparison of the old deal and the new is inevitable. It is necessary.

Frightened at the thought of the comparison the reactionary politicians and the interests they represent have thought to divert attention from the old deal by raising the clamor for a square deal as against the New Deal.

True the average man—the farmer, the worker, the miner—has been getting the squarest deal he has had in generations under the New Deal, but the interests are not thinking of these.

They want a kind of square deal that will allow financial tricksters and gamblers to enrich themselves as before by gambling with the money of innocent investors resulting in the loss of hundreds of millions.

They want a square deal for the banks, which to some of them means the right to use depositors' money for gambling enterprises on the market while refusing loans to legitimate business enterprise.

It has been made dangerous under the New Deal for great banking institutions to flood the American market with foreign bonds the bankers knew or were warned would be repudiated, and these financial speculators want a "square deal" of a type that will allow a renewal of such nefarious practices.

The exploiters of the farmers, who have bought the products of their toil at ruinous prices and raised the price to the consumers for their own enrichment, want their kind of a square deal. The New Deal has brought the intervention of the people's Government for the protection of the farmers who feed the Nation.

Those who by questionable methods of manipulation flooded the market with securities that brought prices grotesquely out of proportion with the value of the stock, and are now compelled to play fair with the investing public, are clamoring for a square deal. All the New Deal has done has been to protect the honest investor in his savings; and that is not a square deal at all in their way of thinking.

The utility combines, whose methods are well illustrated in the revelations of the lobby investigation, and who have been milking the public with the smug acquiescence of Government, are threatened with regulations that will give a square deal to the consumers—but to the power magnates this is not a square deal for them.

Under the New Deal does the farmer get a square deal? Ask them. The answer is "yes."

Does the worker get a square deal? Ask them. Their spokesmen declare that under the New Deal they are getting the squarest deal they have ever had.

The men in industry, growing old after a lifetime of service for society in the factories, and haunted by the fear of being thrown out into the street to starve when too old to work, are now insured against that horror by the New Deal—and that is a square deal for them.

The average man depositing his hard-earned money in banks as a protection for his old age, for the education of his children, whose money was swept away under the old deal because of vicious banking methods, is now protected—and under the New Deal he has a square deal, too.

And the honest legitimate banker, whose bank was losing the confidence of the public because of the vicious methods of unscrupulous bankers, has been accorded a square deal by the New Deal reforms, which restores the confidence of his patrons.

Does the miner, reduced to desperation by the state of chaos to which selfishness has reduced the great mining industry, get a square deal under the New Deal? The head of the miners declares publicly they are coming nearer to getting a square deal than ever before.

And does the jobless, anxious to work, and left to private charity for bread for himself and children, want the old deal or the new? Under which does he get a square deal? Ask him! He will answer in the affirmative.

The reactionaries seeking a restoration of the old deal are the old dealers who never gave a square deal to the public in their lives and never will, without the intervention of the people's Government.

The issue is the New Deal with its square deal against the Old Deal, in whose vocabulary the words "square deal" never appeared until now.

Is the New Deal a square deal for you? The answer is yes; and it is my honest opinion that so many affirmative votes will be registered in November as to cause our critics to shudder in their selfishness and our supporters to contemplate with confidence the completion of the entire New Deal program under 4 more years of Roosevelt and recovery.

OUR NATIONAL DEFENSE—VOCATIONAL EDUCATION A STRONG FACTOR

Mr. SNYDER of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SNYDER of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, one of two things a nation must always do, pay small sums to educate and train its youth or pay large sums to regulate crime and build prison walls.

It almost dumbfounds us when our attention is called to the fact that in 1932 we spent only \$2,968,010,400 to educate and train the youth of our Nation, while we spent \$12,000,000,000 to look after crime and all of its ramifications. In other words, we spent practically four times as much money in 1932 for crime as we did to educate and train our youth. We spent more money in these United States in 1932 for crime and its ramifications than we did to build and support churches, plus homes for our people, plus educating and training our youth for future citizenship.

Mr. Speaker, I am strong for the support of this vocational education bill now before this House. Speaking of national defense of our Nation, the only national defense we have for the future of the Nation lies in the training of the boys and the girls who are to take up the reins of Government when we lay them down.

Without a record vote, a few weeks ago this House passed the national defense war bill of \$600,000,000 and the Navy bill of over \$500,000,000 for the national defense of our Nation.

And now there is a disposition on the part of some to question the advisability of giving \$12,000,000 a year to educate the hand, the heart, and the head of the boys and girls of this Nation to equip them to go out into life's school and earn an honest living.

Mr. Speaker, someone has well said, "We must educate, or we must perish." This axiom is ever true. To perpetuate our form of government we must educate our boys and girls in homemaking, in industrial arts, and in agricultural pursuits.

We must see to it that when our youth go out into the business world that they have a clear understanding of what is necessary in business procedure and government in order to perpetuate our institutions. We must put forth every effort to bring them to a full realization that the homes, the schools, and the churches of our Nation must be perpetuated if our democracy is to continue to function. We must adjust our educational institutions from time to time so as to dovetail into the social and economic conditions as each succeeding generation finds them.

Therefore, it is only natural that the youth of our Nation should expect this Congress to give them this \$12,000,000 in order that they may be better trained in the vocational avenues they will have to travel when they get out in the workaday world.

FURTHER MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A further message from the Senate, by Mr. Horne, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a bill and joint resolution of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 12870. An act to aid in defraying the expenses for the celebration of the bicentennial of the birth of Patrick Henry to be held at Hanover Courthouse, Va., July 15, 16, and 17, 1936; and

H. J. Res. 525. Joint resolution to enable the United States Constitution Sesquicentennial Commission to carry out and give effect to certain approved plans, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 11687) entitled "An act to amend the Federal Aid Highway Act, approved July 11, 1916, as amended and supplemented, and for other purposes."

The message also announced that the Senate had adopted a concurrent resolution of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. Con. Res. 39. Concurrent resolution empowering the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate to have printed 2,000 additional copies of the hearings held before the subcommittee of said committee of the Senate during the first session of the Seventy-fourth Congress pursuant to the resolution (S. Res. 185) authorizing the Committee on Appropriations to conduct an investigation of the expenditures by the Federal Government for the cotton cooperatives, etc.

The message also announced that the Senate recedes from its amendment no. 2 to the bill (H. R. 9496) to protect the United States against loss in the delivery through the mails of checks in payment of benefits provided for by laws administered by the Veterans' Administration.

REFERENCE OF PRIVATE CLAIMS BILLS

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of H. Res. 498 which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Resolution 498

Resolved, That Rule XXI, clause 3, be, and is hereby, amended to read as follows:

"3. No bill for the payment or adjudication of any private claim against the Government shall be referred, except by unanimous consent; to any other than the following-named committees, namely: To the Committee on Foreign Affairs, to the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to the Committee on Pensions, to the Committee on Claims, to the Committee on War Claims, to the Committee on the Public Lands, and to the Committee on Accounts."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object. Will the gentleman please explain the reason for this?

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, this is an amendment of the rules with reference to the referring of private claims bills. For many years the Committee on Foreign Affairs has been handling private claims relating to the Consular Service. Some time ago a suggestion was made that a point of order might lie against such claims. There are some on the Consent Calendar, and to obviate the possibility of a point of order being made against a long-established custom, an amendment to this rule seems necessary, and the Committee on Rules reported it out and it was thought that this would be the most expeditious way of disposing of it.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. As I understand, the other committees are agreeable to this?

Mr. O'CONNOR. Yes.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman explain whether or not this resolution changes the rule with respect to the committees that are authorized to report out bills appropriating money?

Mr. O'CONNOR. Not at all.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

INAUGURATION OF THE PRESIDENT

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of Senate Concurrent Resolution 38, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate Concurrent Resolution 38

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That a joint committee consisting of three Senators and three Representatives, to be appointed by the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives, respectively, is authorized to make the necessary arrangements for the inauguration of the President-elect of the United States on the 20th day of January next.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object. I shall not object, because we want to have a good celebration when Governor Landon is inaugurated next January; but will the gentleman please explain why we should make the arrangements now?

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, as the gentleman knows, the "lame duck" amendment advanced the date of the inauguration from March 4 to January 20. When the in-

auguration was on March 4 the Congress, which met in December, could provide for this, but arrangements must be made sometime in the fall, or not later than November, as I am informed, for the celebration of the event to which the gentleman from Massachusetts so optimistically referred.

If the committee is going to handle it, it must be done now.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

PARKS AND PARKWAYS FOR RECREATIONAL-AREA PURPOSES

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 10104) to aid in providing the people of the United States with adequate facilities for park, parkway, and recreational-area purposes, and to provide for the transfer of certain lands chiefly valuable for such purposes to States and political subdivisions thereof, with Senate amendments, and agree to the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Utah?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman say something about these amendments?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. This bill was passed by the House, and the Senate did away with about three-fourths of the bill, but permitted it to pass in one particular only.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. What does the bill really provide, as it now stands?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. It provides for the cooperation with States in making surveys of national parks and park areas.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Has this been to a committee?

Mr. ROBINSON of Utah. This bill was passed by the House. It went to the Senate, and the Senate amended it, and we are asking to accept the Senate amendments.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I think the gentleman should withdraw it for the time being and let us look into it. The members of that committee on this side of the House are not present at this time.

Mr. Speaker, at this time I must object.

THOMAS JEFFERSON MEMORIAL

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 522.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Resolution 522

Resolved, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of H. R. 12027, a bill to authorize the execution of plans for a permanent memorial to Thomas Jefferson, and all points of order against said bill are hereby waived. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and continue not to exceed 1 hour, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Library, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the same to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted, and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion, except one motion to recommit, with or without instructions.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'CONNOR].

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, in view of the interest expressed, I might say that the Rules Committee does not propose to call up any other resolutions after this one today.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I yield.

Mr. BLANTON. If the rule is passed now, does the gentleman expect to call up the bill this afternoon or on Monday?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. We expect to call it up this afternoon. There is only 1 hour of general debate. I do not think we will take very much time on the rule.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN].

I now yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from New York [Mr. BOYLAN].

Mr. BOYLAN. Mr. Speaker, I do not propose to take but a few minutes on the rule, because the Members are all familiar with it.

The subject matter is that of providing a memorial in the city of Washington to the memory of Thomas Jefferson. On April 13 last I delivered an address, in which I explained in detail what the commission proposed to do. That date was the one hundred and ninety-third anniversary of the birth of Thomas Jefferson.

In the Seventy-third Congress I introduced a resolution calling for the appointment of a committee to take this matter under consideration. The committee consisted of three members appointed by the President of the Senate, three members appointed by the Speaker of the House, three members appointed by the President of the United States, and three members appointed by the Thomas Jefferson Memorial Foundation. That is the foundation that raised the funds to purchase the home and grounds of Thomas Jefferson at Monticello.

The Members of the House were the gentleman from Virginia, Mr. SMITH, the gentleman from New York, Mr. CULKIN, and myself. Those appointed by the Senate were Senator McNARY, Senator LONERGAN, and Senator THOMAS of Utah. The Presidential appointees were Thomas Jefferson Coolidge, Collins Randolph, both lineal descendants of Thomas Jefferson, and Joseph Tumulty. The representatives from the Thomas Jefferson Foundation were Stewart Giboney of New York, president of that foundation, Fiske Kimball of Philadelphia, director of the Metropolitan Museum of Philadelphia, and the third representative, Dr. George Ryan of New York, president of the board of education, who was instrumental in raising the funds for the purchase of Monticello.

We have worked on the project and secured the services of a distinguished architect, John Russell Pope, who was the architect of the Archives Building in Washington, the most beautiful of the group, from Pennsylvania to Constitution Avenue; he was also architect of the famous war memorials for the United States Government abroad, and the buildings of Yale University, and also architect of the Shriners' Temple in Washington on Sixteenth Street, the most beautiful specimen of Egyptian architecture in the United States. Everything we have done has been in harmony with the Fine Arts Commission and with the National Park and Planning Commission. We have reached a state now that we are asking for the authorization to go ahead with our plans. The understanding of all concerned is that no application is to be made this year for any funds. The application for funds will be made to the next Congress or some subsequent Congress. All we ask today is an authorization for funds, so that it can be honored at some future time, and we can proceed to the erection of this memorial.

You all know the particular reasons why we should honor Jefferson. If there would be no other reason, it would be the fact that he was the author of the Declaration of Independence. Just consider a young lawyer journeying to the city of Philadelphia from his home in Virginia, at that time in his early thirties, and sitting down in a small furnished room in a house in the city of Philadelphia and writing the Declaration of Independence. Those of us who have to make little speeches here on various subjects on the floor know how we sometimes have to sweat it out of ourselves. We have to get information from various sources, look up works of reference; yet here was a young lawyer who came into this small room in a house in Philadelphia, sat down, and wrote with his own hand, without any assistance whatever, the Declaration of Independence.

As I have explained, there is no partisanship at all in the appointment of this commission, as both parties are represented. We regard, and most Americans regard, Jefferson as

next in the hearts of the people to George Washington. Other founding fathers throughout the years ought to be remembered, but at this time we seek to honor the memory of Thomas Jefferson.

Just imagine! The average visitor comes to the city of Washington and inquires where he can find the Jefferson memorial, only to be told there is no memorial to Jefferson in the Nation's Capital except one small statue outside the east entrance of the Hall of the House of Representatives, and that is on a raised pedestal, and unless someone attracts your attention to it you do not even see it.

Jefferson himself was a very modest and unassuming man; and I think at this late date it is little enough for us, in appreciation of the splendid services he rendered the Republic, to erect this monument to him in the Capital City. We do not ask that it be erected anywhere but in Washington, where the whole Nation will see it and where it will stand out as the offering of a grateful people to the young Virginian who did so much toward the founding of our country. [Applause.]

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOYLAN. I yield.

Mr. GIFFORD. Have the plans gone so far that the type of a memorial has been determined upon?

Mr. BOYLAN. Not except that it is to be of classical design. Several suggestions have been made. It has been suggested that it be a large monument of Jefferson and to the rear or the sides of it a marble building to house Jeffersoniana.

Mr. GIFFORD. Would there be a profile of Jefferson himself?

Mr. BOYLAN. Yes; I may add that the building would house not only Jeffersoniana, but matters that have been written about him.

Mr. GIFFORD. Would the gentleman mind a suggestion? I would suggest to the members of the commission that if there is to be a profile of Jefferson himself, it be made with tears streaming down the cheeks.

Mr. BOYLAN. I do not quite get the meaning the gentleman desires to convey.

Mr. GIFFORD. Our liberties have gone; and he would be feeling dreadfully about it were he alive. He should be so pictured, should he not?

Mr. BOYLAN. I may say to my friend from the illustrious shores of rugged Cape Cod that our greatest concern in this matter is honoring the memory of Jefferson.

Mr. GIFFORD. Only a memory.

Mr. BOYLAN. We are not going into the philosophy of the situation; we are simply asking a memorial to perpetuate the name of the man who wrote the Declaration of Independence, who was the author of the statute of religious liberty in Virginia, and who was the founder of the University of Virginia.

Mr. GIFFORD. And he is only a memory; not a living, vital force. I was hoping somebody would suggest that the freedom he advocated still lived and that his works of long ago still existed.

Mr. BOYLAN. I am sure any aid or assistance the gentleman could give to perpetuate the name, the fame, and the memory of Thomas Jefferson would be gratefully appreciated by the American people. [Applause.]

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON].

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker—

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to permit me to submit a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. KNUTSON. Yes, gladly.

ADJOURNMENT OVER

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today it adjourn to meet on Monday next.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

THOMAS JEFFERSON MEMORIAL

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I believe this is the first time that the party in power has made any move to honor the memory of an outstanding Republican. Not only was Thomas Jefferson an outstanding Republican, but he was one of the early exponents of an adequate tariff to promote and protect American industry. The time was when Thomas Jefferson's memory was honored by the Democrats. Yearly they gave Jefferson dinners in various parts of the country at \$1 per plate, but as the need for Democratic campaign funds increased the New Dealers realized they could not very well boost the price to \$50 per plate at a Jefferson dinner because he had been held up to us as the embodiment of simplicity and rugged Americanism. So the party in power placed Mr. Jefferson upon the shelf and brought Andrew Jackson down, dusted him off, and put on a \$50 dinner, not only in Washington but in various parts of the country. They could, of course, think of no more appropriate date upon which to give a \$50 dinner than on Jackson Day because Andrew Jackson believed in the spoils system.

Thomas Jefferson went into partial eclipse when it was found that the New Deal program ran contrary to the Constitution of the United States. No more do we hear him mentioned on your side of the aisle. He is not even a memory to most of you. I have often wondered, as I have sat in this Chamber the past 3 years, what Mr. Jefferson must be thinking as he looks down from his place in the azure blue and contemplates what those who belong to the party to which he belonged are doing in the name of democracy and to bring about a more abundant life.

The Republicans revere the name of Thomas Jefferson. We believe he was a great American. He does not need a memorial to perpetuate his name and fame any more than do Lincoln and Washington, but now that we have erected memorials to those two great Republicans it is only fitting and proper that we erect a memorial to that other great Republican, Thomas Jefferson. [Laughter.]

Mr. Speaker, before leaving the Chamber my colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH], prepared an amendment which he asked me to offer in his absence. I ask unanimous consent that the Clerk may read this amendment in my time.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I did not yield time for the purpose of amending the rule.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I have 10 minutes, and I hope the gentleman will not consume my time.

Mr. SMITH of Virginia. I did not yield for the purpose of amending the rule.

Mr. KNUTSON. I am just having the amendment read so that the Members may give it consideration.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. KNUTSON for information: Page 1, line 12, after "\$3,000,000", insert: "Provided, That there shall be inscribed upon such monument or memorial the oath taken by Mr. Roosevelt to 'implicitly follow and observe the principles and teachings of government enunciated by Thomas Jefferson.'"

Mr. BANKHEAD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KNUTSON. I yield to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Who did the gentleman say proposed this amendment?

Mr. KNUTSON. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH].

Mr. BANKHEAD. I am not surprised that he refrained from offering it himself and delegating that task to the gentleman from Minnesota. He was probably ashamed to do it in person.

Mr. KNUTSON. I will say to my good friend that the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH], who could not be here, merely wishes to remind the majority of certain obli-

gations that the Democratic Party took 3 years ago, which have been very conveniently forgotten. Of course, you all would prefer to forget certain things that were promised to the American people in 1932.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GIFFORD].

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I thought there was considerable interest in this matter, else I would not have requested the 5 minutes. I do want to suggest, however, that this is an inopportune time to erect a memorial to Thomas Jefferson. I think I may well be speaking for the real Jeffersonian Democrats, most of whom are now taking a walk. It would seem that at this time the matter of expense ought to appeal to you, but the matter of \$3,000,000 is nothing for this administration after all. People may be going hungry and dependent on relief, yet you consider spending money for such a purpose.

Mr. Speaker, I hope the Members will not think I am lacking in full appreciation of this great man. I think we should perhaps do something to perpetuate his memory, even if his great works and doctrines have now been abandoned by his party. Certainly I recall that he made a great struggle for the liberties of the people. I read somewhere only yesterday that it would be harder to get back our liberties from the Government bureaucracy, which we are establishing at the present time, than if our liberties had been taken away by a dictator. These great bureaus will wish to perpetuate the stranglehold which they are steadily acquiring over us.

Do you Democrats really feel that you have been loyal enough to Jeffersonian principles during these recent days of experimentation to point out to the young people of this Nation who come to Washington a great memorial to Jefferson? They will say "Yes; he was indeed a great patriot, but he did not believe as his own party believes today." They must necessarily have been taught about him, and they must know that we have departed almost entirely from his teachings. I wish I could bring back to my mind more quickly at this moment the many tenets that he held sacred and which have been so violently repudiated by his own followers. I was not entirely facetious when I suggested to the gentleman from New York that Jefferson ought to be pictured with tears streaming down his face if his likeness be included in the memorial.

Mr. KNUTSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIFFORD. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. KNUTSON. Has it ever occurred to the gentleman that perhaps the Democrats are trying to salve their consciences?

Mr. GIFFORD. It occurred to me that perhaps they feel at this particular time they ought to try to keep up appearances to the public at large by pretending at least they still believe in and respect their great leader of long ago.

Mr. HOUSTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GIFFORD. I yield to the gentleman from Kansas.

Mr. HOUSTON. A moment ago the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. KNUTSON] stated that he would like to know what Jefferson was thinking of as he looked down upon the New Deal.

I wonder what Jefferson thought when he looked down on the Harding administration and the Hoover administration of do nothing.

Mr. GIFFORD. Tears would be shed by some Republicans at some of the things that happened during the Harding administration.

Mr. HOUSTON. I would think so.

Mr. GIFFORD. We do not pretend that in all individual cases all our leaders were perfect.

Mr. HOUSTON. Does the gentleman mean those who are in the penitentiary as the outgrowth of that administration?

Mr. GIFFORD. We bow our heads in shame at some of the things that happened then. But we are willing to acknowledge it. Some people are big enough to do that.

Mr. HOUSTON. The gentleman does not boast of it?

Mr. GIFFORD. No; I do not boast of it. I recently heard your own President compared to that person who said, "If

I ever had the opportunity to acknowledge a mistake, I would be very glad to do it." But, of course, he appears unwilling as yet to acknowledge that any errors have occurred in these many futile experiments.

[Here the gavel fell.]

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. KELLER. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 12027) to authorize the execution of plans for a permanent memorial to Thomas Jefferson.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 12027, with Mr. SHANNON in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

Mr. KELLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. GREENWOOD].

Mr. GREENWOOD. Mr. Chairman, I have no desire on this occasion to enter into any political argument about this proposal, but I should like to speak in my own time of some of the outstanding achievements in the life of Jefferson, which this memorial would commemorate.

Recently I visited the Library of Congress and had the privilege of looking over the library of Jefferson. I noted the wide scope of the scholarship of this great American. There were books on architecture, scientific farming, education, government, and various international questions.

Thomas Jefferson was able to speak and read six languages, and they say at the time of his death he was learning a seventh language.

We know of his great contribution to American government and to the affairs of the world.

A few years ago I had the pleasure of visiting Monticello, his home, and I observed that magnificent residence, which one great architect said was the finest and most outstanding piece of Grecian architecture embodied in residential style in America. I went down to the hillside of the old homestead where Jefferson is buried, and there on his monument is an epitaph written by Jefferson himself, and it is in these words:

Here is buried Thomas Jefferson, the author of the Declaration of American Independence and of the statutes of Virginia for religious freedom and father of the University of Virginia.

This great American had been Governor of the State of Virginia. He had been our Minister to France. He had been Secretary of State under George Washington and Vice President under John Adams and twice President of the United States, but all of these political honors were ignored in his epitaph and he set out these three outstanding achievements: Author of the American Declaration of Independence, which sounded to the world the principles of representative democracy; author of the statutes of Virginia, the principles of which were later incorporated in the Bill of Rights, which gave American independence of religious thought and belief; and father of the University of Virginia, a democracy of education upon which any representative democracy in government must be based.

These were three outstanding achievements, but perhaps the greatest of these was authorship of the Declaration of Independence. Previous to the Revolution the world knew very little about representative government, governed only by monarchies. The doctrine of the divine right of kings prevailed, whereby the monarch could do no evil. Because of his divine appointment, the monarch ruled and could commit no error; but the fathers of the American Revolution had expressed in this Declaration their thought that government is dependent upon the consent of the governed, and America has made 150 years of progress along this line. If Thomas Jefferson were to come back today, there would be no occasion for tears in his eyes because of the progress made or the standing of America in the family of nations. Representative government as proposed by Jefferson has en-

dured. It was a new doctrine and a new creed that Thomas Jefferson laid down in this Declaration, that no longer could a monarch claim divinity and rule with arbitrary power, but that governments derived their just powers from the consent of the governed. This is America's greatest contribution to the civilization of the world, and Thomas Jefferson is the author of this thought that was written into the Declaration of Independence and later embodied in the Constitution of the United States. We have evangelized the world, and other democracies have followed the principles laid down by Jefferson.

Too long we have delayed paying proper honor to this great man whom we do not claim from a partisan standpoint, but because he was a great American. Like Lincoln and like Washington, he was a great American and belongs to the ages. He made his contribution to the progress and advancement of our Nation and the civilization of the world, and as one individual Member of the House I am pleased that we can pay tribute to him by properly commemorating his life and achievements in the Capital City of our country. This bill should pass without division of opinion. [Applause.]

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT].

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, the membership will recall that this bill has been on the Consent Calendar for some weeks. On each occasion when that calendar was called there has been a great deal of discussion, not on the life and character of Jefferson, not on the feasibility of erecting a suitable memorial to his memory, but on the more material aspects of this bill, and that is this:

Can we, as Members of this House of Representatives, with a clear conscience, every one of us believing, as I think we believe, that we should cut the expenses of this Government to the very bone, vote to authorize an appropriation of \$3,000,000 at the present time for this or any other like purpose?

I do not think there is a Member of the House who reveres or respects the memory of Jefferson more than I always have. He was one of the great outstanding Americans. He was one of the great, if not the greatest, exponents of the rights of the common people.

Those of us who are now somewhat solicitous of the rights and prerogatives of the people look to Jefferson himself for guidance, and Thomas Jefferson would never consent under these conditions to spend \$3,000,000 of the people's money to erect a memorial to him.

If you revere the teachings of Jefferson, if you are conscientious in wanting to respect that great humanitarian, you will never consent to add to the burden of the taxpayers of this Nation any more money than you have, especially for a purpose which can be delayed until we have at least approached the balancing of the Federal Budget.

I have listened for the last 5 years in this House to pleas in behalf of the unemployed men and women who have not enough bread, milk, and meat for themselves and their children. I have listened to more demagoguery in that respect than ever before came out of the mouths of legislators.

Today you plan to divert the equivalent of the aggregate income of 3,000 families averaging \$1,000 each at a time when that income is badly needed to keep body and soul together. Gentlemen, the responsibility is yours. If you can, in the face of the conditions which confront this country today, with 12,400,000 people out of employment, with the States, counties, and municipalities burdened in addition to what the Federal Government is giving them for support of our needy—if you can, with a clear conscience, vote \$3,000,000 for the erection of a memorial even to so great a man as Thomas Jefferson, it is your responsibility, and I have said all that I care to say on the subject. [Applause.]

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. CULKIN].

Mr. CULKIN. Mr. Chairman, when the Jefferson Memorial Commission was appointed I was honored by membership on that body. The association has been most delightful and has more or less led me to read more liberally

than I had on the subject of Jefferson. Jefferson, to my mind, is, perhaps, the outstanding liberal of the ages. I heard Calvin Coolidge deliver an address at a commencement exercise and he referred to the Declaration of Independence and stressed the part that men of various types played in the Revolution. He said that Jefferson could not have fought the battles of the Revolution and that Washington could not have written the Declaration of Independence. Former President Coolidge's conclusion was that we could not have won the Revolutionary War without the participation of both these great Americans. I am not going to try out title here to Jefferson's partisanship. I think that is interesting, and, of course, in these days is becoming controversial. I simply call the attention of the House to the fact that this outstanding liberal, who by his pen laid the foundation of free institutions in America, is without a monument or marker to his memory in this great National Capital. Our Commission has been over this situation. We have considered the greatness of Jefferson's achievements, the question of cost, the question of construction, and all of those details, and this bill is the fruit of our nonpartisan discussion.

I have listened with interest, but not with alarm, to the discussion of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Wolcott]. It is just as important in these days to the youth of America that their souls should be fed as well as their bodies. [Applause.]

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CULKIN. In a moment. The only way that this will be accomplished is to encourage and inculcate in the youth of America a desire to study the history and the achievements and contributions to human liberty that were made by this man whom I again call the outstanding liberal of the ages. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I have been taught always to believe that unless the body is fed the soul might depart from that body and would be fed on another shore. Does the gentleman not think it is more important to feed the body in order that the soul might enjoy the beautiful things we have on earth?

Mr. CULKIN. If the citizenship of America loses its soul—and it will if it is forgetful of the memories and sacrifices and leadership of the past—then we descend to the level of dumb beasts. This is one effective way to bring to all Americans what Jefferson stood for in government. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Dirksen].

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. Chairman, I am opposed to the erection of this memorial for three reasons. The first is that the memory of Thomas Jefferson does not need this memorial. The second is that as we build these extrinsic monuments we destroy in the heart of America the capacity for real inspiration to be derived from great men, and the third reason is that we probably could put this money to better use under an emergency. So far as the first reason is concerned, let me remind you, if you go to St. Paul's Cathedral in London and begin to clamber through those great recesses and up into the nave you will see an inscription which says, "If you would see the monument to the builder, look about you." That is true. If you want to see the monument to Sir Christopher Wren, the architect of St. Paul's, look about you and there you will see the great edifice, dedicated to the retreat of the human soul, where people can go and forget their tribulations and worries for a little while. It seems to me that if we want to find a memorial to Thomas Jefferson we must look about us in America. That is a far more verile and living memorial than a great mass of dispassionate stone and masonry to be erected in Washington. I am one of those unorthodox idealists who somehow feel that we have missed the mark, so far as Thomas Jefferson is concerned.

He stands out as an exemplar of the spirit of democracy, trying to bring human hearts together. As I survey the American scene today I sometimes wonder whether we have made a single bit of progress since the teachings of the Carpenter of Nazareth in bringing human hearts together. How light would be our burden, how easy of solution would be our problem if there was not forever that spirit of contest, that spirit of difference that translates itself into invectives and terms of vituperation. That is the thing that Thomas Jefferson taught—democracy. We have missed the goal. I do not believe that a \$3,000,000 memorial is going to be very inspirational, either to this generation or to the generations that are to be.

It is a rather significant thing that on tomorrow, in all the cemeteries of the land, speakers will ascend the rostrum and speak about the sacrifices that we made for this wonderful country and for our permanent institutions. They will speak about catching the spirit and inspiration of those sacrifices, and yet the significant thing is that the fragrance of the flowers dies before the setting sun and all the beautiful rhetoric somehow passes away on the evening breeze, so seldom do we catch the spirit in the human heart, which is, after all, the only worth-while shrine.

In proportion as we catch the inspiration of Jefferson here and translate it into human hearts in America, we will have done something far greater than by spending \$3,000,000 on a great building that is cold and lifeless and not given to any kind of inspiration.

Mr. GREENWOOD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIRKSEN. No. My time is too short.

The third reason is this: I believe we can put the money to better use. For instance, there are projects in my district where cities are trying to secure necessary sewer improvements, and the reason they cannot get them is because there is lack of bonding power and insufficient contribution on the part of the Federal Government, so that they cannot institute proceedings that are going to better conditions under which they must live. If we have \$3,000,000 to spend, let us use the money properly and give it to some of those districts, some of those school districts that now have inadequate educational facilities, and that would like just a few dollars or a few thousand dollars with which to repair and improve the conditions under which the children in those areas must go to school.

Would it not be a far better thing, as a matter of fact? As the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Wolcott] said, I cannot reconcile my conscience to the expenditure of \$3,000,000 when Thomas Jefferson's memory does not need it, when we create an incapacity in the hearts of the country for catching the real inspiration, and when the money can be used to a far better and more practical use. [Applause.]

It is regrettable that partisanship should creep into this discussion. It is far too reverential for that. Any discussion of memorials is necessarily an appeal to the religious nature of every man on this floor. I revere the memory of Jefferson as much as the most ardent Democrat in this Nation. But there is an essential fitness about things and this does not appear to be the time for such a memorial.

It would be far better to cater to the practical needs of the distressed people of this Nation in a time of emergency than to be expending \$3,000,000 on a memorial that is unnecessary.

It has been said here today that man does not live by bread alone. Let the authors of that suggestion finish the language of that text. It continues: "But by every word * * *." Yes; by every word. The real memorial to Jefferson is the degree to which the human heart captures his inspiration and reveres his memory, and to rely upon a memorial such as is proposed is but to eloquently confess our incapacity for finding that inspiration without first gazing upon a great mass of masonry and stone.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. KELLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. MAY].

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, at the last moment I have obtained consent of my own mind to give expression to my feelings upon this occasion.

I regret exceedingly that any man capable and able to occupy a seat in this great deliberative assembly would at this time raise any partisan question in connection with this effort to build a memorial to one of America's greatest men. From the foundation of the world there has been at work in this world two classes of people—two crews. There has been a construction crew and a wrecking crew. Thomas Jefferson belonged to the construction crew and was opposed to the wrecking crew. If Thomas Jefferson had never done anything more than write the Declaration of Independence, that enunciated the doctrines which took from the backs of the defenseless people the autocratic foot of autocracy, he would have immortalized himself. If he had never done anything more than help pen the Virginia statutes of religious liberty, which meant to the peasant, to the man in the ditch, the same that it meant to the President of the United States or the monarch on his throne, he would have immortalized himself. If Thomas Jefferson had not succeeded in making his name historic for all generations to come by those two acts, he would have completed the task when he founded and erected under his own supervision the great institution of learning, to send light and inspiration to the people, over at Charlottesville, Va., the third great achievement, of which he was proud to the end of his entire career.

Then today the question is raised whether it is prudent or wise for the Congress of the United States to appropriate an infinitely small sum of \$3,000,000 to build a statue in the Capital City of the Nation to this great author of a great government theory and government philosopher. I am not willing for the school children traveling from the East, the West, the North, or the South to go upon the streets and highways of this country and find memorials to Thomas Jefferson here and there, and then come to the United States Capital and find a statue of Washington, a statue of Daniel Webster, of Lincoln, and a few others who compared with Thomas Jefferson, and go back home and say to the teacher, "I visited the great Capital City of Washington. I traveled the streets and avenues. I searched and looked in vain for a monument reared to Thomas Jefferson in the Nation's Capital."

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. KELLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 additional minutes to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. MAY. The inference would be that the Congress, with the power to appropriate, had neglected to perform its duty in properly memorializing the name of the man who recognized in the Declaration of Independence that all men are born free and equal, and have certain inherent and inalienable rights, among which are to be reckoned the right to life, to liberty, and to the pursuit of happiness. These great doctrines—human life, human liberty, and human happiness—were the great principles that stimulated and inspired Thomas Jefferson to write the great books he did that the school children of the future may read as works of inspiration.

When they walk up and down Pennsylvania Avenue I want them to be able to look upon a statue built of marble and granite that will stand through the centuries, defying the corroding touch of time, as a tribute to the founder of the great principles of democratic government. But I say to you now that you do not disparage his great name by calling him Republican or Democrat. He was known as a Republican in his day. If Thomas Jefferson were living today, the people of America would place him side by side with the immortals of the ages. Let us build a monument to his memory that will stand there like a great beacon light to attract the eye and inspire the souls of our children and our children's children, and on down through the generations of the future. [Applause.]

Mr. COLDEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAY. I yield.

Mr. COLDEN. We have beautiful monuments in this city to Washington and Lincoln, but is it not a fact that the greatness and honor of these two men were born of the ideals and the spirit of Thomas Jefferson?

Mr. MAY. Both of them were students of Thomas Jefferson. [Applause.]

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. LUCKEY].

Mr. LUCKEY. Mr. Chairman, no one can have greater respect for this great statesman and publicist, this man who sponsored the rights of the common people, Thomas Jefferson, than I; but I feel that this is not the proper time to spend \$3,000,000 on a monument to his memory. Today in this House we have agreed to the expenditure of practically \$800,000,000. In the words of our good friend from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH], "Where are we going to get the money?"

The great humanitarian needs of this day are too great to merit this proposed expenditure, or that now under way at St. Louis, where millions are now being spent on another Thomas Jefferson Memorial. Let us apply some of the ideals of that great man whom we would thus memorialize and husband our resources so that they may be used in behalf of the citizens of this country to whom Jefferson dedicated his life.

I think it is about time we stopped this spending. I, too, would like to see a monument to Thomas Jefferson, but this is not the time to erect it. We have hundreds and hundreds of monuments here and the people hardly notice them. I see them walking through these Halls day after day hardly recognizing or paying attention to the monuments standing along the corridors.

A few days ago our attention was called to the deplorable conditions existing at the National Training School for Girls in this city. There is a place we ought to put our money. There is a place we can build character and where our money will count for something. Let us put our money where it can be used to develop living monuments that will be a credit to the ideals of Jefferson.

I shall, therefore, Mr. Chairman, oppose this measure at this time, much as I should like to see a wonderful monument erected to this great statesman; but this is not the time to make this expenditure. Let us vote this measure down. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO].

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Chairman, I believe that if we are going to spend any money on Thomas Jefferson it would be a splendid idea, rather than erect a monument of marble and granite, to send out to the members of the Liberty League and the proponents of various alien and sedition legislation some of the teaching of Thomas Jefferson.

For instance, I think if Thomas Jefferson were alive today there are certain gentlemen in this House, and distinguished gentlemen, too, who would ask for the indictment of Thomas Jefferson.

Thomas Jefferson said in a letter written to W. S. Smith in 1787:

God forbid we should ever be 20 years without such a rebellion.

He was referring to Shay's rebellion.

The people cannot be all and always well informed. The part which is wrong will be discontented in proportion to the importance of the facts they misconceive. If they remain quiet under such misconceptions, it is lethargy, the forerunner of death to the public liberty.

Again, Thomas Jefferson said in a letter:

I hold it that a little rebellion now and then is a good thing, and as necessary in the political world as storms are in the physical.

Imagine what some investigating committee would have done to Thomas Jefferson if he were alive today.

Also, in a letter to W. S. Smith, written in 1787, Thomas Jefferson said:

What country can preserve its liberties if its rulers are not warned from time to time that the people preserve the spirit of resistance? Let them take arms. The remedy is to set them right as to facts.

If Thomas Jefferson had attempted to make a statement like that over the radio today, I wonder how many gentlemen would rise on the floor of the House of Representatives and demand that the radio broadcasting company cancel Thomas Jefferson's broadcast.

A great deal is said nowadays about the right of the Supreme Court to declare laws passed by the representatives of the people unconstitutional. Thomas Jefferson was there in those days when the Constitution was written, and he knew what was meant when the Constitution was written. He had a pretty good idea as to what kind of government they were trying to set up at that time. Here is what Thomas Jefferson said with reference to the Supreme Court:

It has long been my opinion * * * that the germ of dissolution of our Federal Government is in * * * the Federal judiciary—

Note what he said about the Federal judiciary—

an irresponsible body, working like gravity by night and by day, gaining a little today and a little tomorrow, and advancing its noiseless step, like a thief over the field of jurisdiction.

Then, again, in a letter to Spencer Roane, in 1821, Jefferson said:

The great object of my fear is the Federal judiciary. That body, like gravity, ever acting, with noiseless foot and unalarming advance, gaining ground step by step, and holding what it gains, is engulfing insidiously the special governments into the jaws of that which feeds them.

The Supreme Court has certainly gained plenty of ground since Thomas Jefferson made that statement. A lot of territory has been taken from the days of the decision of Marberry against Madison to the Guffey coal decision.

Again, in a letter to William C. Jarvis, written in 1820, Thomas Jefferson said:

It is a very dangerous doctrine to consider the judges as the ultimate arbiters of all constitutional questions. It is one which would place us under the despotism of an oligarchy * * *.

I think he had a right to talk about the powers of the Court under the Constitution, because he was around the country in those days when the Constitution was written.

Again he said:

The Constitution has erected no such single tribunal, knowing that to whatever hands confided, with the corruptions of time and party, its members would become despots. It has more wisely made all the departments coequal and co-sovereign within themselves.

* [Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman 2 additional minutes.

Mr. LUNDEEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. LUNDEEN. From what document is the gentleman reading?

Mr. MARCANTONIO. I am reading from the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD which contains excerpts from Jefferson included therein by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. MAVERICK].

Coming back to Thomas Jefferson and this proposed memorial, may I say that I am going to vote against the measure first of all because, as I stated in the debate today on the conference report on the naval appropriation bill, there are too many people being taken off the W. P. A. on the ground of economy. Three million dollars would put a lot of W. P. A. workers back to work, and I feel if Thomas Jefferson were alive today, and if he had the choice between erecting a monument to himself or to some other great patriot for that matter, or giving work to the unemployed, he would vote to furnish work to the unemployed.

More important than anything else is this. If you do erect a monument to Thomas Jefferson, then let it not be a monument of mortar or granite, but let us print and

widely distribute these teachings of Thomas Jefferson so that they may permeate in the heart and mind of every American.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. KELLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to use to the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. LUNDEEN].

Mr. LUNDEEN. Mr. Chairman, I have just a few words to say. I am in favor of the Thomas Jefferson memorial. It should have been built years ago. Men do not live by bread alone. There is something spiritual in this world. There is a lesson we need to be taught by the inspiring memorial that is to be erected in this great American city. It will help to keep forever before us the American plan of government: That all men are equal; that life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness are inalienable rights; that the first duty of government is to safeguard those rights and guarantee them. Today violent attacks are being made against democratic government throughout the whole world. We in America should remember Thomas Jefferson and the Declaration of Independence.

Freedom—religious, political, economic—comes to us not as a matter of course. Freedom comes only after bitter strife and is preserved and fostered by struggle. "Eternal vigilance is the price of liberty."

Thomas Jefferson was our foremost apostle of human liberty. He had infinite faith in the common people at a time when democracy was only a name. He was more than a liberal, a progressive, in his day. He was a radical. He was author of the most revolutionary document ever written. He is the great inspiration of forward-looking people today.

The spokesmen of reactionary forces sometimes attempt to shape the philosophy of Jefferson to fit their selfish ends. But in the Declaration of Independence, Thomas Jefferson speaks for himself. When the forces of reaction invoke his soul in oratorical tribute, we defend him from their praise.

I shall be pleased to vote for this great Thomas Jefferson memorial.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LUNDEEN. I yield.

Mr. MAY. As a matter of fact, in the construction of this memorial at a cost of \$3,000,000, 80 percent of it will go for wages to the men who build it.

Mr. LUNDEEN. Certainly; and I am sure the American people will erect a great memorial commemorating the life and services of Thomas Jefferson. We who revere the memory of Lincoln should recall that Lincoln was a disciple of Thomas Jefferson. He was a student of Jefferson and continually quoted him.

The gentleman from Illinois spoke about the schools. I always want to aid our schools. I have fought a great deal on this floor for schools. In my speeches of May 16 and August 7, 1935, I pointed out the impoverished condition of the schools and demanded Federal aid for schools and students. The emergency education and recreation program, Federal project no. 1, should be continued and enlarged, and I urge Members to see that sufficient appropriations are made for this purpose. We want to carry on many activities that will help the country and someone has asked here: "Where are we going to get the money?" I may say that if you will tax the wealth of this country and the great fortunes of this country, you will have plenty of funds to carry on. We should at least apply the British rates. There are men like Eugene Grace, of the Bethlehem Steel, getting over \$1,000,000 a year in salary and bonus, and one of our great publishers in 1935 getting over \$500,000 a year as salary. Railroad executives are receiving amounts running higher than the salary of the President of the United States, and yet they are trying to demolish the Minneapolis & St. Louis Railroad in the State of Minnesota and destroy jobs and wages for our railroad men.

THE PUBLIC IS OPPOSED TO M. & ST. L. SPLIT-UP

A resolution introduced by our Farmer-Labor Senator, ELMER BENSON, asks that the Interstate Commerce Commission withhold approval of the proposed dismemberment of the Minneapolis & St. Louis Railroad until a committee

of Senators can investigate the social and economic effects of the proposed sale and the origin of the proposal. I hope this resolution will be favorably reported out by the committee and passed by the Senate. The people of Minneapolis and Minnesota and other States affected have a right to know just what the effects of this dismemberment will be and why it is being advocated when State and municipal officials, business, labor, and the Farmer-Labor Party of our State are definitely opposed. Why is this plan being advanced? Who is behind it? These facts must be brought out before the Interstate Commerce Commission is permitted to pass upon the proposal.

Of the eight railroads composing the Associated Railways Co., which was formed to bring about this purchase, one has already withdrawn. The Great Western Railway withdrew when its officials learned that the public is opposed to the plan, that more than a hundred communities would be deprived of services they now enjoy, and that more than 3,000 M. & St. L. employees will be imperiled.

The other companies composing the Associated Railways are the Great Northern, Burlington, Illinois Central, Soo Line, Rock Island, North Western, and Milwaukee roads.

MINNEAPOLIS BUSINESSMEN OPPOSE DISMEMBERMENT

The Minneapolis City Council retained a special attorney, Charles E. Elmquist, who is also attorney for the M. & St. L. executive defense committee. George K. Belden is chairman of the businessmen's committee assisting in opposing the dismemberment plan. Businessmen of Minneapolis realize that loss of jobs for more than 1,000 Minneapolis employees would be a serious economic blow to the city. The grocers, butchers, bakers, and creditors of these employees are concerned.

Minneapolis businessmen are interested in this matter to the extent that they conducted a tour over the Minneapolis & St. Louis line to check up on reports of the road's condition. They found in a 1,000-mile trip over the Minneapolis & St. Louis line to Peoria, Ill., and return, that stories about the broken-down condition of the road were greatly exaggerated. Their trip took them through Albert Lea, Mason City, Marshalltown, Oskaloosa, Des Moines, and Fort Dodge. They took a special train. Their party was composed of 35 businessmen. They found the railroad made average passenger running time. They made comments on the smooth-riding qualities of the trackage. This committee found throughout Iowa and southern Minnesota a growing support of the railroad. They passed through 90 miles of track scheduled for abandonment between Fort Dodge and Albert Lea. Immediately upon their return they began active solicitation of defense funds, they appointed captains of defense teams, and they are now calling on merchants and others directly affected.

WHAT IS BACK OF THIS MOVE?

When we compare the financial condition of the Minneapolis & St. Louis with the financial condition of the railroads wishing to purchase the Minneapolis & St. Louis, we wonder what is back of this move. It happens that the Minneapolis & St. Louis owes the R. F. C. nothing. The North Western is indebted to the R. F. C. for \$46,589,000, according to the January statistical number of Railway Age. The Minneapolis Tribune reports that the Milwaukee has debts of \$12,000,000; the Rock Island, \$13,718,700; the Illinois Central, \$17,863,000, with an application for \$7,488,000 more; the Soo Line, \$6,843,002. The Minneapolis & St. Louis management expects to make a net of \$750,000 or more this year. This would be a 5-percent return, which most railroads have not been making in recent years.

The Minneapolis terminal of the railroad alone has been valued by the Interstate Commerce Commission at more than \$4,000,000, and the entire system at more than \$35,000,000. The Associated Railways are trying to get this property for \$7,200,000, and the R. F. C. is apparently willing to loan \$4,750,000 to the Associated Railways to finance the reorganization of the M. & St. L. It appears that the R. F. C. offer, made in 1934, preceded by a few months the efforts of these seven railroads to purchase the M. & St. L. The people of Minnesota and the Northwest have a right to know why the

R. F. C. made this offer apparently before being requested to do so, and why the chief examiner of the railroad division of the R. F. C. continues to play an important part in the hearings being conducted at the present time in the various States affected. The people of these States are overwhelmingly opposed to the plan. Many of those who have attended the hearings held by the Commission in the districts affected have reached the conclusion that the matter would never have been seriously considered had it not been pressed by agents of the R. F. C. Witnesses have been unable or are unwilling to furnish evidence showing the origin of the plan. The present earnings seem to justify a capitalization of the railroad of \$17,000,000, which is \$10,000,000 more than the Associated Railways offer to pay.

M. & ST. L. EMPLOYEES MUST BE PROTECTED

Mr. Speaker, I have a mandate from the people of the Third Congressional District of Minnesota to oppose dismemberment of the Minneapolis & St. Louis Railroad. I am serving on a congressional committee created to prevent this dismemberment. From the first moment the attack began, from the very first mention of dismemberment, we answered the attack. We went into the front lines to repel those who for selfish reasons planned injury to Minneapolis, Minnesota, and the Northwest.

The split-up of this railroad would be a serious blow to Minneapolis, Excelsior, Hopkins, and over a hundred other communities in the States of Minnesota, North Dakota, South Dakota, Iowa, and Illinois. It is a blow to the entire Northwest. The M. & St. L. has the second largest pay roll in the city of Minneapolis. The wives and children of these 3,000 employees are directly affected. Labor is opposed to the plan and that is enough for me. A thousand railroad men are in danger of losing their jobs. They will enter the ranks of twelve and a half million already unemployed.

We demand a thorough investigation of the origin of the plan to dismember the Minneapolis & St. Louis Railroad. We want to know the motives back of it. The people have a right to know the economic and social results of such a plan. The Benson Senate Resolution 287 to investigate the M. & St. L. dismemberment would accomplish this purpose. When I endorse this resolution, I speak for the citizens of Minneapolis, St. Paul, Hennepin County, Excelsior, Hopkins, and other communities in Minnesota.

Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record, and include such data and information as may be applicable to the remarks I have made here.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LUNDEEN. I yield.

Mr. WOLCOTT. How can the gentleman from Minnesota and the gentleman from Kentucky say that 80 percent of the money for the construction of this monument is going to labor, when the Commission has not agreed upon any design, although they have given some consideration to it? We are expected to vote \$3,000,000 for a monument, the design of which has not been considered to the point of giving us any information whatever as to what it is even going to look like.

Mr. LUNDEEN. So far as that is concerned, I will say to the gentleman I have every confidence in the Commission and in the architects and designers of the monument. I am not expert in this line and I am not concerned about that.

Mr. CULKIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LUNDEEN. Yes.

Mr. CULKIN. The fact is that 90 percent of the \$3,000,000 will be expended in material, workmanship, and labor. Does the gentleman know that?

Mr. LUNDEEN. I have received information to that effect, and I believe that is true.

Mr. CULKIN. And the bill that is offered here is offered as the joint offering of a group that has considered this matter for an entire year.

Mr. KELLER. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] such time as he may desire.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Chairman, I must confess I have been somewhat surprised at some of the arguments that have been presented during the course of the discussion of this matter. I very deeply regret that in the consideration of a proposal to erect a memorial to one of the great, outstanding Americans, any possible tinge of partisanship or sectionalism should enter the controversy.

I happen to recall that in the year 1911 the Congress of the United States passed a resolution providing for the setting up of a commission for the construction of an adequate memorial to the life, character, and achievements of Abraham Lincoln, and although I am the son of a Confederate soldier who fought for 4 long years to destroy the Government that Abraham Lincoln was trying to preserve, it gave me pleasure, not only to see the passage of that resolution in 1911, but, subsequently, to know that my party, under Woodrow Wilson's administration, composed very largely of southerners, had carried forward and provided the funds for the construction of that great everlasting memorial down yonder on the Potomac River to the memory of one of the greatest men, in my opinion, this country has or ever will produce. [Applause.]

Why were sentiments of this character aroused in my bosom? Simply because I believe in the spiritual philosophy of One greater than any man who ever walked this earth, who said that "man shall not live by bread alone." When noble memories and reverence for the traditions of the past no longer appeal to our people, then there is danger that the Republic may perish. [Applause.]

The monarchies of Europe are not ungrateful or unmindful of their great and heroic figures. Those of you who have traveled abroad in the great capitals of foreign nations will see upon every street and avenue magnificent memorials and effigies erected to their great, outstanding leaders, while the charge has been made that republics are ungrateful. I trust this is not true of ours.

And here on this floor this afternoon I am surprised to hear some men, even Democrats, arise and say that the Government of the United States cannot afford this amount of money to erect an everlasting memorial to the greatest political philosopher and humanitarian of the age.

They ask if Jefferson were alive would he approve of this? Possibly no. If Abraham Lincoln, from your State of Illinois, you who just opposed this resolution, were alive and he had been asked if he wanted this great memorial constructed at a cost of \$3,000,000, out of his innate modesty, he probably would have said no; you can turn it to a more useful purpose.

But that is not the issue here—what those men may have said. Happily the achievements of great men are not measured by themselves or their contemporaries but by a grateful posterity.

We ought to be ashamed to haggle over the small authorization, not expenditure, to construct an adequate memorial to that great man who was the author of the Declaration of Independence, of our statutes for religious freedom, the founder of the University of Virginia, the real constructive advocate of the Bill of Rights in our Federal Constitution—I say it seems to me it is rather a small position for any American, Democrat or Republican, to take the stand that we ought not to authorize this sum to perpetuate the memory of that man who, in my opinion, has impressed the minds of all men on the philosophy as well as the perpetuity of our institutions. I hope this bill will pass. [Applause.]

Mr. KELLER. Mr. Chairman, I had not expected to speak, but I shall use 2 or 3 minutes of the remaining time at my disposal. I call attention to the fact that stone as it lies in the ledge represents only 5 percent of the cost of the building into which it is to go, and that in monuments it represents much less; that in all buildings here the labor represents 95 percent, and in the monuments vastly more than that. So it does seem to me that since we are providing work at the present time there could be no other

possible way in which you could be more justified in providing work that gives such tremendous percentage of the amount expended to labor.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KELLER. Yes.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Will the gentleman give us an outline or some information of the proposed memorial—what it is going to look like?

Mr. KELLER. That has not been worked out as yet.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Has it been worked out at all? Can the gentleman give us any idea about what it is going to look like? Can the gentleman give us any idea how much is going to be paid for labor and how much is to be paid for granite?

Mr. GREENWOOD. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman will permit, so far as the building of monuments is concerned, I had occasion recently to go into that with reference to the Clarke Memorial, and the statement of the gentleman from Illinois is correct, so far as stone in the ledge is concerned or iron ore is concerned. More than 90 percent of the cost of the structure is represented in labor, transportation, and construction.

Mr. WOLCOTT. But one gentleman assured us that 8 percent would be for labor.

Mr. GREENWOOD. Oh, no; 80 percent.

Mr. WOLCOTT. How does anybody know how much is going to be paid for labor?

Mr. GREENWOOD. I went into a study of that.

Mr. WOLCOTT. How does the gentleman know it is going to be made of granite or bronze?

Mr. GREENWOOD. Whether it is in the form of granite or limestone or marble, the value of the stone is insignificant compared to the amount paid for labor, transportation, and construction. Statistics show that more than 90 percent of the value goes for labor.

Mr. WOLCOTT. And if it happens that this monument is not built of granite, the gentleman's remarks are of no avail.

Mr. GREENWOOD. Oh, not at all.

Mr. WOLCOTT. We have nothing to show that it is even going to be made of granite. If it is to be made of bronze, how much will go into labor?

Mr. GREENWOOD. The same statistics apply, whether it is made of marble or granite or any other building material.

Mr. KELLER. Mr. Chairman, I do not yield further. I ask the gentleman from New York [Mr. BOYLAN] whether some plans have been made.

Mr. BOYLAN. Mr. Chairman, let me say to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT], he has persistently made the misstatement that no plans have been made. This is about the fifth speech that he has made in opposition to this memorial.

Mr. WOLCOTT rose.

Mr. BOYLAN. I do not yield. The gentleman had his say, and plenty. The gentleman is interested only in a mere mess of pottage.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BOYLAN. I do not yield.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I think the gentleman, in all fairness after making that charge, should yield.

Mr. BOYLAN. I do not yield.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me to answer the charge that he had made that I am interested only in a mess of pottage?

Mr. BOYLAN. I do not yield.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. BOYLAN. Repeatedly, Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Michigan has been told that a distinguished architect has prepared plans. Not only did I tell him it again in my remarks today, but on four previous occasions I have told him. He has ears and he will not hear. I told him these plans were submitted, not only to the Commission, but to the Chief Executive of the United States. Yet all he has in his

mind is what is it going to cost, who is going to get the money. I cannot add a word to the beautiful sentiments expressed by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], that outside of the mere question of food, which is talked about so much by the opposition, there is a spiritual value in this memorial that will revivify and rekindle the patriotism of our people. [Applause.]

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to my colleague from Michigan [Mr. WOLCOTT].

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I think there are two statements here that should be answered.

Mr. KELLER rose.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I do not yield to the gentleman, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. KELLER. Mr. Chairman, I supposed that all time had expired.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I do not yield to the gentleman for a parliamentary inquiry or for any other reason.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois exhausted all time on his side of the Chamber.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Chairman, there are two questions that should be answered. In the first place, having some solicitude for the welfare of the people of this Nation who are on relief and have not shelter over their heads, I am accused of having interest only in a mess of pottage. A mess of pottage, my friends, when there are 12,400,000 people out of employment today, and we have appropriated \$10,000,000,000 here in the last few years to feed the hungry of this Nation. A mess of pottage!

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. President, I think it is laudable that you gentlemen went along in 1911—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I understood I had been yielded 3 minutes.

Mr. MAPES. I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I think it was laudable that the Democratic side of this House, as well as the Republicans, went along together in the erection of the memorial to Abraham Lincoln in 1911. If conditions in this country now were as they were then, I think I would feel much differently about this. However, at that time the national bonded indebtedness was less than \$1,000,000,000, and today it is over \$32,000,000,000, and constantly growing. How can you reconcile your actions in voting \$3,000,000 for this monument in face of that situation?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

All time has expired.

The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Thomas Jefferson Memorial Commission (hereinafter referred to as the Commission), heretofore created for the purpose of considering and formulating plans for designing and constructing a permanent memorial in the city of Washington, D. C., to the memory of Thomas Jefferson, shall determine upon a plan and design for, and proceed with the construction of, such memorial upon a site selected by the Commission, under a contract or contracts hereby authorized to be entered into in a total sum not exceeding \$3,000,000.

SEC. 2. In the execution of its functions the Commission—

(a) May designate as its executive agent any officer, agency, or establishment of the Federal Government qualified and equipped to act in that capacity, and any such officer, agency, or establishment so designated is authorized to act as such agent.

(b) May avail itself of the assistance and advice of the Commission of Fine Arts, and the Commission of Fine Arts shall, upon request, render such assistance and advice.

(c) May make expenditures for personal services, without regard to the provisions of the civil-service laws and regulations or the Classification Act of 1923, as amended, the purchase or preparation of plans, designs, and estimates, printing and binding, office equipment and supplies, contract stenographic reporting service, books and periodicals, traveling expenses of members and employees of the Commission (including such expenses and allowances for members of the Commission when required to be in Washington, D. C., in connection with the work of the Commission), and such other contingent and miscellaneous expenses as may be necessary: *Pro-*

vided, That section 3709 of the Revised Statutes (U. S. C., title 41, sec. 5) shall not be construed to apply to any purchase or service rendered for the Commission under authority of this subsection.

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee will rise.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. SHANNON, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 12027, and, pursuant to House Resolution 522, he reported the same back to the House.

HISTORY OF FEDERAL BUREAU OF INVESTIGATION

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, in 1908 Attorney General Charles J. Bonaparte ordered the creation of a staff of investigators to have jurisdiction over all investigative matters within the purview of the United States Department of Justice. A small group of about 35 agents was authorized to make the necessary investigations.

This was the humble beginning of the Federal Bureau of Investigation which has come within the past few years to be known as the foremost law-enforcement body in the world.

TWO PERIODS OF GROWTH

There have been two periods in the growth of the Federal Bureau of Investigation. The first extended from its inception in 1908 to May 1924. During this time many new duties devolved upon the investigative staff of the Bureau. In 1912 the white-slave laws were passed. During the World War there was an increase in duty resulting from the activities of enemy aliens. Also demanding the investigative attention of the agents of the Bureau were the National Motor Vehicle Theft Act and the Bankruptcy Act.

ENLARGEMENT OF INVESTIGATIVE UNIT

The enlargement of this investigative unit until 1924 was the result of a natural growth. That is to say, each problem was handled as it arose. There was no looking into the future; there was no certain goal or standard toward which this unit was striving. There was only the business of investigating violations against the laws of the United States and gathering evidence in cases wherein the United States was an interested party.

GOOD LEADER SOUGHT

In 1924, when Harlan F. Stone, now a Justice of the United States Supreme Court, was appointed Attorney General of the United States, he regarded this routine manner of operation as wholly inadequate. It was clear to him that what the Bureau needed was an ideal and a leader who believed in it.

Back in 1908, when the Bureau of Investigation of the United States Department of Justice was first being created and organized, a young fellow 13 years of age was attending the public schools of the District of Columbia. Upon his graduation from high school, he entered the Library of Congress as a clerk and studied law at George Washington Law School in the evenings. In 1917 he was a clerk in the Department of Justice, and in 1919 he was appointed special assistant to the Attorney General. From 1921 to 1924, he served as Assistant Director of the Bureau of Investigation.

JOHN EDGAR HOOVER APPOINTED

This was the man whom Attorney General Harlan Stone chose to carry out the ideal of honest and efficient law enforcement. His name was John Edgar Hoover.

STRIVING TOWARD A GOAL

Less than 30 years of age at the time of his appointment as Director of the Federal Bureau of Investigation in May 1924, Hoover, even then, envisioned the day when the Bureau would be an efficient crime fighting organization, powerfully equipped with the necessary paraphernalia for exterminating the rats of the underworld and striving toward a goal of ridding this country of its blight of crime.

MR. HOOVER ANSWERS TO NO ONE BUT THE ATTORNEY GENERAL

Hoover knew what he wanted and he had the assurance of Attorney General Stone that as Director, Mr. Hoover would answer to no one but the Attorney General and that as far as he was concerned, the Bureau of Investigation was a separate Government agency, free from all outside interference. It was evident that Justice Stone knew what he wanted. He wanted this young man, Hoover, to give full vent to his enthusiasm.

Once in office, Hoover wasted no time. He completely reorganized the Bureau and effected many economies in its administration.

SELECTION OF PERSONNEL

His first thought, however, concerned the personnel under his supervision. For the task ahead, he wanted young and progressive men, well educated and forward-thinking. He immediately ordered that the age limits for new agents of the Bureau be set from 25 to 35 years and that preference in appointment be given to qualified attorneys. The seniority rule of promotion was discarded. All advancements in the service were to be based solely on merit. He weeded out undesirables. There rapidly developed a corps of men who brought to their work the same enthusiasm as their Director. Today there are a few more than 600 of these special agents. They have been carefully selected from thousands of applicants. They must be graduates of law schools of high standing, expert accountants, or have had constructive types of law-enforcement experience. In addition, each must have had at least 2 years' practical experience in the business world.

These are high educational requirements but to Mr. Hoover they are not sufficient to enable an agent to start the work of investigating. He must know more. Hoover, therefore, instituted a training school for agents. Here, over a period of 14 weeks, the newly appointed agent receives an intensive course in all phases of law-enforcement work. He studies the elements of each of the offenses against the United States; he becomes thoroughly versed in the methods of scientific crime detection; he becomes an expert in the science of fingerprinting and a qualified handler of all types of firearms.

FINGERPRINT COLLECTIONS

At the beginning of his term, Director Hoover was also concerned with another problem—the centralization of the fingerprint collections scattered throughout the country. After tireless efforts in that direction, he was successful in having transferred to the Federal Bureau of Investigation the records of the identification bureau of the International Association of Chiefs of Police and the fingerprint collection of the Federal Penitentiary at Leavenworth, Kans. There were a little over 800,000 fingerprint cards with which to institute this national fingerprint exchange. It was pledged to give free service to any law-enforcement agency desiring to avail itself of these facilities. At every opportunity, Director Hoover has endeavored to preach the doctrine of coordination of all the forces of law and order in the fight against crime; without it his ideal of law enforcement cannot survive.

Phenomenally the collection has grown until today there are over 5,900,000 cards on file with an average of 4,500 arriving daily from approximately 10,000 contributing agencies. At the commencement of this work, the Identification Division received but 300 cards a day from less than 1,000 agencies. At that time only 14 percent of the incoming records were identified; today, previous criminal records are established in over 50 percent of the cases referred to the Bureau.

TRAINED STAFF OF TECHNICIANS

Intent on moving forward, Hoover early realized the need for a trained staff of technicians to attack a crime problem from the viewpoint of science. Acting to meet this need, he established a technical and research laboratory to assist in the current criminal investigations conducted by the Bureau's special agents. He has offered to the outside world of law enforcement the full facilities of this laboratory, evidencing again his supreme desire for cooperation among

law-enforcement agencies. In addition, the laboratory, in the true spirit of the Bureau, is engaged in conducting research in the various police sciences. Improved methods of scientific crime detection will be placed in the possession of all peace officers who earnestly desire to raise the standards of their profession.

CRIME STATISTICS COMPILED

In 1930, Congress granted Hoover the authority to collect and compile crime statistics. It was the beginning of the important work of gathering national police statistics on a uniform scale so that those interested in crime trends and the remedies therefor would have tangible figures to point the direction toward which their efforts should be expended.

YOUNG CRIMINALS

With the aid of these statistics, Hoover is now able to call the attention of the country to the fact that 20 percent of the criminal element is composed of persons not yet of voting age. With these figures, he has hopes of making the people of this Nation crime conscious; of yanking their heads out of the sand and forcing them to face squarely the problem of law enforcement.

COOPERATION WITH LOCAL OFFICERS

The program of cooperation with local and State law-enforcement agencies, so evident in the projects of Director Hoover, was extended recently in the establishment in Washington, D. C., of training schools for municipal and State law-enforcement officials. The course of training lasts for a period of 12 weeks and covers the broad general field of law enforcement. Two classes have graduated. Since that time nearly all these men have advanced to better positions in their respective organizations. Many are engaged in the work of instructing their fellow officers in the modern criminal-detection methods learned during their training in Washington. These student-officers have returned to their homes convinced of Hoover's desire to cooperate with every honest and upright local authority.

During this entire march of progress, Hoover saw another great need. There was something radically wrong in the restrictions which beset his agents. Time after time, his men were called upon to cope with dangerous criminals who were armed in many cases with the latest and deadliest of weapons; yet Congress had not seen fit to empower agents to carry firearms. In fact, these special agents of the Federal Bureau of Investigation had no authority to make arrests but had to rely on local law enforcement officers to effect desired apprehensions.

ROVING BAND OF CRIMINALS

But something had been happening all this time. There arose in certain sections of this country a roving band of criminals, the backwash from the later prohibition era. These bandits boldly entered banks in broad daylight, gathered up their loot, and sped in high-powered automobiles across State lines. The local police, lacking funds, gave up the chase. The same thing happened in the commission of other crimes. Once these crimes were committed, their perpetrators fled to another State and in most cases were safe to continue their careers of depredation. Mr. Hoover sat in his office in Washington and saw all these things. He knew he was powerless to come to the aid of the local authorities. Even if he were, his agents were unarmed and without authority to make arrests. Something had to be done to remedy this grave fault in the Nation's fight against the lawless.

ATTORNEY GENERAL CUMMINGS CHAMPION OF LAW ENFORCEMENT,
NEW LAWS PASSED

Appointed by one champion of honest law enforcement, Hoover found another in the present Attorney General of the United States, Hon. Homer S. Cummings; and in May and June of 1934, with the passage of new laws by Congress, another milestone of law enforcement was reached. This legislation included the Federal reward bill (of which I was the author), the National Stolen Property Act, the Extortion Act, and the Federal antiracketeering statute. Another act made it a Federal offense to rob national banks and member banks of the Federal Reserve System; still another

made it a Federal offense to flee from one State to another to avoid prosecution or giving testimony in certain cases. Heretofore, the killing or assaulting of a Federal officer was not an offense against the United States; prosecution had to be instituted in the State courts. An act was passed to remedy this strange situation.

AGENTS PERMITTED TO CARRY FIREARMS

With the passage of these bills and the delegation of the investigative duties thereunder to the Federal Bureau of Investigation, came the authorization for special agents to carry firearms and the power to make arrests. Congress had already in June 1932 passed the Federal kidnaping statute, commonly known as the Lindbergh law.

MOST ACTIVE PERIOD OF BUREAU

The period from June 1932 to May 1936 has been the most intensively active in the entire history of the Bureau. There is a saying that the more laws you have, the more crime will result. But these laws passed by Congress were not made to break; they were made to catch the criminal; to supply a stopgap to the free-flowing interstate commerce of lawlessness. Hoover realized this and also realized that the Bureau was about to stand a stern trial. He also knew that if he triumphed, his ideal of law enforcement would be well on its way to attainment.

BAD MEN OF COUNTRY APPREHENDED

Much that is sensational has been written within the last few years about the Federal Bureau of Investigation and its Director, John Edgar Hoover. These years witnessed the imprisonment or death of criminals such as Dillinger; Homer Van Meter; Fred, Doc, and Ma Barker; "Pretty Boy" Floyd; "Baby Face" Nelson; Alvin Karpis; William Mahan; Thomas H. Robinson, Jr.; Harry Campbell; and countless others less notorious but no less a menace to society during their short reigns of terror.

SIXTY-THREE CASES INVOLVING KIDNAPING SOLVED LAST 4 YEARS

Since the passage of the Lindbergh law in June 1932, 63 cases of kidnaping and plots to kidnap have been investigated and solved. The sentences of the 149 persons thus far convicted total 2,095 years, 11 months and 2 days. This does not include the 31 life sentences, the 4 death sentences, nor those persons who committed suicide or who were killed resisting arrest or murdered by their compatriots.

NEW BANK ROBBERY ACT

The Federal Bank Robbery Act was passed on May 18, 1934. Since then 187 cases of robbery of national banks of the Federal Reserve System have been reported to the Bureau. Investigations in these cases have resulted in the conviction of 115 persons in the Federal courts and the imposition of 3 life, 1 indeterminate, and over 2,500 years in sentences. On August 23, 1935, Congress by amendment, included in the Federal Bank Robbery Act all insured banks of the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation and thereby added a great deal to the duties of the special agents of the Bureau.

CONVICTIONS IN 95 PERCENT OF CASES

Very few people know that since the beginning of the present fiscal year, July 1, 1935, until April 30, 1936, the Federal Bureau of Investigation has secured over 3,000 convictions with sentences of more than 8,000 years, together with one of death and three of life imprisonment. Still fewer people know that in the same period recoveries of property and savings to the Government amounted to 28½ million dollars. These are the figures that tell the true story of Director Hoover's administration of the Federal Bureau of Investigation. But there is another final figure which demonstrates the efficiency of this law enforcement Bureau. Of the cases investigated by the Federal Bureau of Investigation and brought to trial since July 1, 1935, 95 percent have resulted in convictions.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. BLACKNEY (at the request of Mr. MAPES), on account of important business.

To Mr. HIGGINS of Connecticut, indefinitely, on account of death in family.

To Mr. MERRITT of New York, for 3 days, on account of illness.

SENATE BILL AND CONCURRENT RESOLUTION REFERRED

A bill and concurrent resolution of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 4618. An act granting the consent of Congress to the Louisiana Highway Commission to construct, maintain, and operate a free or toll highway bridge, or a railway bridge in combination with a free or toll highway bridge, and approaches thereto across the Mississippi River at or near Baton Rouge, La.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. Con. Res. 39. Concurrent resolution empowering the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate to have printed 2,000 additional copies of the hearings held before the subcommittee of said committee of the Senate during the first session of the Seventy-fourth Congress pursuant to the resolution (S. Res. 185) authorizing the Committee on Appropriations to conduct an investigation of the expenditures by the Federal Government for the cotton cooperatives, etc.; to the Committee on Printing.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

Mr. PARSONS, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 4148. An act for the relief of the Thomas Marine Railway Co., Inc.;

H. R. 9125. An act for the relief of Dr. F. U. Painter, Dr. H. A. White, Dr. C. P. Yeager, Dr. W. C. Barnard, Mrs. G. C. Oliphant, Amelia A. Daimwood, the Sun Pharmacy, Bruno's Pharmacy, Viola Doyle Maguire, Louise Harmon, Mrs. J. B. Wilkinson, Sisters of Charity of the Incarnate Word, Grace Hinnant, Dr. E. O. Arnold, and Jennie Chapman;

H. R. 12120. An act to provide for the further development of vocational education in the several States and Territories;

H. R. 12527. An act making appropriations for the Navy Department and the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1937, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 12870. An act to aid in defraying the expenses for the celebration of the bicentennial of the birth of Patrick Henry to be held at Hanover Courthouse, Va., July 15, 16, and 17, 1936.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to an enrolled bill and a joint resolution of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 4533. An act granting the consent of Congress to the Mississippi State Highway Commission to construct, maintain, and operate a free highway bridge across the Pascagoula River at or near Wilkerson's Ferry, Miss.; and

S. J. Res. 262. Joint resolution granting the consent of Congress to the States of New York and Vermont to enter into an agreement amending the agreement between such States consented to by Congress in Public Resolution No. 9, Seventieth Congress, relating to the creation of the Lake Champlain Bridge Commission.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Mr. PARSONS, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee did on this day present to the President, for his approval, bills of the House of the following titles:

H. R. 4148. An act for the relief of the Thomas Marine Railway Co., Inc.;

H. R. 9125. An act for the relief of Dr. F. U. Painter, Dr. H. A. White, Dr. C. P. Yeager, Dr. W. C. Barnard, Mrs. G. C. Oliphant, Amelia A. Daimwood, the Sun Pharmacy, Bruno's Pharmacy, Viola Doyle Maguire, Louise Harmon, Mrs. J. B. Wilkinson, Sisters of Charity of the Incarnate Word, Grace Hinnant, Dr. E. O. Arnold, and Jennie Chapman;

H. R. 12120. An act to provide for the further development of vocational education in the several States and Territories;

H. R. 12527. An act making appropriations for the Navy Department and the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1937, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 12870. An act to aid in defraying the expenses for the celebration of the bicentennial of the birth of Patrick Henry to be held at Hanover Courthouse, Va., July 15, 16, and 17, 1936.

THOMAS JEFFERSON MEMORIAL

The SPEAKER. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill. The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. WOLCOTT) there were ayes 56 and noes 22.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present, and I make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Evidently there is no quorum present.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 20 minutes p. m.) the House, pursuant to the order heretofore entered, adjourned until Monday, June 1, 1936, at 11 o'clock a. m.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII,

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 3296. An act to authorize certain payments to the American War Mothers, Inc.; with amendment (Rept. No. 2888). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. RANKIN: Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation. H. R. 12869. A bill to liberalize the provisions of Public Law No. 484, Seventy-third Congress, to effect uniform provisions in laws administered by the Veterans' Administration, to extend the Employees' Compensation Act with limitations to certain World War veterans and other persons, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 2899). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. THOMPSON: Committee on Ways and Means. S. 3257. An act to amend the World War Adjusted Compensation Act; without amendment (Rept. No. 2890). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. FADDIS: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 12902. A bill to provide a commissioned strength for the Corps of Engineers, United States Army, for the efficient performance of military and other statutory duties assigned to that corps; without amendment (Rept. No. 2891). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. GREGORY: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 12848. A bill to provide an additional place of holding terms of the United States District Court in the Eastern District of Kentucky, and to amend section 83 of the Judicial Code, as amended; without amendment (Rept. No. 2891). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 11614. A bill to amend the Judicial Code to divide the middle district of Georgia into seven divisions by adding a new division to the middle district, and providing for terms of said court to be held at Thomasville, Ga.; without amendment (Rept. No. 2893). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. PALMISANO: Committee on the District of Columbia. S. 1687. An act to incorporate The National Yeoman F;

without amendment (Rept. No. 2894). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. WALTER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 2075. An act to provide for the appointment of additional district judges for the eastern and western districts of Missouri; without amendment (Rept. No. 2895). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. CHANDLER: Committee on the Judiciary. S. 3179. An act to appoint one additional judge of the District Court of the United States for the Eastern, Middle, and Western Districts of Tennessee; with amendment (Rept. No. 2896). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. SOMERS of New York: Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures. H. R. 12756. A bill to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces in commemoration of the memory of the late Dr. Charles P. Steinmetz; without amendment (Rept. No. 2897). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. SOMERS of New York: Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures. H. R. 12677. A bill to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces in commemoration of the three hundredth anniversary of the founding of York County, Maine; without amendment (Rept. No. 2898). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII,

Mr. LESINSKI: Committee on Pensions. H. R. 12908. A bill granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain widows, former widows, and helpless and dependent children of soldiers of the Civil War; without amendment (Rept. No. 2889). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. COFFEE: A bill (H. R. 12909) to amend the Soil Conservation and Domestic Allotment Act to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to make payments or grants of aid under such act to agricultural producers occupying certain public lands; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. RABAUT: A bill (H. R. 12910) to authorize the coinage of 50-cent pieces in commemoration of the one hundredth anniversary of the admission of the State of Michigan as one of the United States; to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

By Mrs. O'DAY: A bill (H. R. 12911) making an appropriation for the purpose of completing a building to honor the detail which captured Major André, the British spy, at Tarrytown; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. SHANLEY: A bill (H. R. 12912) setting up a joint public relief committee to assist Congress in the preparation of data for a permanent relief policy; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. DICKSTEIN: A bill (H. R. 12913) to protect for American actors, vocal musicians, operatic singers, solo dangers, solo instrumentalists, and orchestral conductors the artistic and earning opportunities in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. KOCIALKOWSKI: A bill (H. R. 12914) to regulate the conduct of elections in Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

By Mr. RUSSELL: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 611) to create a Low Cost Research Housing Commission; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mrs. GREENWAY: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 612) for the purpose of increasing and financing employment in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. JONES: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 613) to modify and extend the act entitled "An act to include sugar beets and sugar cane as basic agricultural commodities under the Agricultural Adjustment Act, and for other purposes", approved May 9, 1934; to the Committee on Agriculture.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of South Carolina; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Colorado; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. LESINSKI: A bill (H. R. 12908) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain widows, former widows, and helpless and dependent children of soldiers of the Civil War; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BINDERUP: A bill (H. R. 12915) granting a pension to Nete Richardson; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LEE of Oklahoma: A bill (H. R. 12916) for the relief of Alvin Carroll; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

11011. By Mr. COLDEN: Resolution adopted by the Council of the City of Los Angeles on May 22, 1936, urging favorable action on the Wagner-Ellenbogen housing bill (S. 4424 and H. R. 12164); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

11012. By Mr. DORSEY: Resolutions of Local Union, No. 98 (Philadelphia, Pa.), International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers endorsing the Wagner-Ellenbogen housing bill, and urging its immediate adoption by the Congress of the United States; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

11013. By Mr. JOHNSON of Texas: Petition of Mr. Val Horn, of Mexia, Tex., favoring the Robinson-Patman bill; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

11014. By Mr. KRAMER: Resolution of the Council of the City of Los Angeles, at its meeting on May 22, 1936, relative to the passage of the United States Housing Act of 1936, etc.; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

11015. By Mr. PFEIFER: Petition of the Manhattan Avenue Merchants Association of Williamsburgh, Inc., Brooklyn, N. Y., concerning the Wagner-Ellenbogen housing bill (S. 4424); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

11016. By Mr. SUTPHIN: Petition of Monmouth County (N. J.) Women's Democratic Club, urging that the official name of the resettlement project near Hightstown, N. J., be changed to Monmouth County project no. 3; to the Committee on Labor.

11017. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the New Jersey State Housing Authority; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

11018. Also, petition of the city of Los Angeles, Calif.; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

11019. Also, petition of the Lancaster Central Labor Union, Lancaster, Pa.; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

11020. Also, petition of Lawrence Central Labor Union, Lawrence, Mass.; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

11021. Also, petition of the National Society of the Daughters of the Revolution; to the Committee on Appropriations.

11022. Also, petition of the Office Workers' Union, Local No. 19366; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

11023. Also, petition of the city of Schenectady, N. Y.; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

11024. Also, petition of the city of Louisville; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

SENATE

SATURDAY, MAY 30, 1936

(Legislative day of Tuesday, May 12, 1936)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. ROBINSON, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Friday, May 29, 1936, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Latta, one of his secretaries.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. ROBINSON. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Adams	Chavez	Keyes	Pope
Austin	Clark	King	Reynolds
Bachman	Coolidge	La Follette	Robinson
Bailey	Copeland	Loftin	Russell
Barbour	Couzens	Loneragan	Schwellenbach
Barkley	Davis	Long	Sheppard
Benson	Duffy	McAdoo	Shipstead
Bilbo	Fletcher	McGill	Smith
Black	Frazier	McKellar	Steiwer
Borah	George	McNary	Thomas, Okla.
Brown	Gerry	Maloney	Thomas, Utah
Bulkley	Gibson	Minton	Townsend
Bulow	Glass	Murphy	Truman
Burke	Guffey	Murray	Vandenberg
Byrd	Hale	Neely	Wagner
Byrnes	Hastings	Norris	Walsh
Capper	Hatch	O'Mahoney	Wheeler
Caraway	Hayden	Overton	White
Carey	Johnson	Pittman	

Mr. ROBINSON. I announce that the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. COSTIGAN], the Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], and the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON] are absent because of illness, and that the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. GORE], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. HOLT], the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. LEWIS], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. LOGAN], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. MOORE], the senior Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS], the Senator from Indiana [Mr. VAN NUYS], the junior Senator from Maryland [Mr. RADCLIFFE], the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], the junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIETERICH], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. DONAHAY] are unavoidably detained from the Senate.

Mr. AUSTIN. I announce that the Senator from Iowa [Mr. DICKINSON] and the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. METCALF] are necessarily absent.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Seventy-five Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

COMMITTEE SERVICE

On motion by Mr. ROBINSON, and by unanimous consent, The junior Senator from Florida [Mr. LOFTIN] was assigned to service on the following committees: Claims, Education and Labor, Inter-oceanic Canals, Naval Affairs, Post Offices and Post Roads, and Public Buildings and Grounds.

SUPPLEMENTAL ESTIMATE, DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR (S. DOC. NO. 257)

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a supplemental estimate of appropriation for the Department of the Interior, for administrative expenses of the Division of Territories and Island Possessions, fiscal year 1937, in the sum of \$35,000, which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.